

THE THINKER:

A MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 8.

MARCH, 1893.

No. 3.

THE SURVEY OF THOUGHT.

MODERN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.—The supplementary volume of Hamburger's *Cyclopædia for the Bible and the Talmud*, which completes at last that exceedingly useful but very carelessly printed work, contains several articles which are full of interest to the Christian student because they reveal with tolerable distinctness the present attitude of an important section of the modern Jews to Christ and to Christianity. One point which is very clearly brought out is disappointing to all who long for the conversion of the chosen people. It is painfully evident that the rejection of Christ as Christ, is as emphatic as ever. The Rabbis of the nineteenth century whom our author represents are as confident as Caiaphas and his colleagues that Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah. In the very remarkable article on "Messiahs" our Lord comes near the beginning of the long list of those said to have falsely claimed to be the Christ; and the constant omission of the word "Christ" or "Lord" in dates calculated according to the Christian era reminds the reader continually of the obstinate opposition which is still offered to His claims by a very large number of His own people. Dr. Hamburger is compelled to adopt the Christian method of noting time, but he is careful to express his dissent from Christian beliefs either by putting simply "after," as when, for instance, in indicating the period of the agitation of Theudas, he writes "in 46 after;" or by giving the figures only. On the other hand, there is a conspicuous absence of blasphemous invective. This modern Rabbi finds much to approve in Christ and Christianity. The practical ethics of the latter, which he considers its chief glory, are declared to be one with those of Judaism. He endeavours, however, like Geiger and some other recent Jewish writers to trace the best elements of Christian teaching as recorded in the Gospels to Jewish sources. Jesus, he maintains, possessed considerable knowledge of Scripture and the Law, which he handled expertly according to the methods of the Pharisees. The golden rule was anticipated by Hillel. The declaration that love to God and love to man constitute the substance of the Law is paralleled by a passage in a Midrash. Christ's teaching about the observance of the Sabbath is pronounced similar to that expressed in two Rabbinical sayings quoted also by the Christian Wetstein, one occurring in the ancient Midrash, the Mechilta: "The Sabbath is given to you, and not you to the Sabbath;" and the other found in the Babylonian Talmud: "The Sabbath is given into your hands, and not you into the hands of the Sabbath." All the clauses of the Paternoster are said to occur in the prayers and teaching of the Rabbis, and it is added that short comprehensive prayers of this kind were composed by almost every teacher of importance. The truth that all men are

brethren, which is so beautifully presented in the parable of the good Samaritan, is proved from the Babylonian Talmud to have been not unknown to some of the Rabbis. Our Lord's opposition to the enactments of the Rabbis is said to have been foreshadowed by the Sadducees. Christian teaching concerning the Son of God and the Holy Spirit is connected in some measure with the Alexandrian doctrine of the *Lógos* as stated by Philo. Christianity is therefore considered to be a daughter of Judaism, and as such to be an ally rather than an enemy. To it, and to the other daughter religion, Mohammedanism, Judaism leaves the task of converting the heathen, fully recognizing that as their mission. Proselytizing is now left to Christianity. The Jew makes no attempt to induce all his fellow-men to profess the faith of the synagogue, resting content if they accept as true its teachings about human happiness. There is little if anything in these opinions which can be pronounced absolutely new, but the moderation of the tone in which they are expressed as contrasted with the boundless hatred of Christ, and everything connected with Him which seems to have been cherished by most Jews during the ages when the Talmuds and the Midrashim were compiled, is a striking and pleasing indication of the decline of uncompromising intolerance in Rabbinic circles. Let us hope that it foreshadows a far more momentous change in the not distant future.

MEDIAEVAL ANTICIPATIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.—An essay by Prof. Bacher, of Buda Pesth, which first appeared a month or two ago in the Jewish anthology, coming out under the editorship of Dr. Wuensche and Dr. Winter, and has just been reissued in separate form, entitled *Biblical Exegesis from the Beginning of the Tenth to the End of the Fifteenth Century*, shows very clearly that some of the conclusions of the Higher Criticism about which we hear so much to-day, and to some extent its principles, were curiously anticipated by Jewish exegetes during the period which we are accustomed to designate the Dark Ages. The Pentateuch, which had until then been regarded with a blind veneration verging on idolatry, was handled with considerable freedom by several of these advanced thinkers in the Jewish schools. One Chivvi, about the middle of the ninth century, is said to have made two hundred objections to the credibility of the Books of Moses, attacking both the legal and the historical portions, and to have found an appreciative public. Fifty years later his text-books were in use amongst teachers in the district of which Sura was the centre. Another of these forerunners of Pentateuchal criticism was Isaac Ibn Jasus, a grammarian and exegete of the eleventh century, who ascribed the composition of a part of Genesis to the time of Jehoshaphat. It must be allowed that this view, as well as other startling opinions propounded by its author, met with little favour from the greatest of the mediæval Jewish commentators, Aben Ezra, who indeed pronounced them ridiculous; but still the mere fact that such suggestions were made is significant of the intense intellectual activity of mediæval Judaism when stimulated by

Arabian influence. A third Jewish inquirer, belonging to the North of France, Joseph surnamed Bechor Shor, got a glimpse of the occurrence of duplicate narratives in the Pentateuch. He argued that the two accounts in the seventeenth of Exodus and the twentieth of Numbers respectively refer to the same event. A curious though faint adumbration of the documentary hypothesis. One of the boldest of these precursors of the Higher Criticism was Moses Ibn Gikatilla, of Cordova, who flourished in the second third of the eleventh century. He admitted Exilic psalms, and referred the latter part of the Book of Isaiah to the period of the second temple. An interesting example of his freedom in the discussion of Biblical questions has been preserved to us by his contemporary and opponent, Jehudah Ibn Balaam, of Toledo, in the latter's exposition of the passage in the Book of Joshua concerning the standing still of the sun and moon. Jehudah assumed a temporary stoppage of the spheres, whereas Gikatilla supposed the phenomenon to be caused by the continued reflection of the solar light after sunset. "What leads you to this belief?" inquired the orthodox Rabbi of Toledo. "I consider it impossible," replied his speculative brother of Cordova, "that the perpetual motion of the spheres should cease." This, we are told, was one of the many misleading and pernicious opinions propounded by Gikatilla. Another of the same revolutionary type, whose name unfortunately is lost, made a daring onslaught on the text of the Hebrew Scriptures, pointing out nearly two hundred passages in which the substitution of another word for that handed down by tradition would restore the original reading. The same path was in some measure trodden by Abul-walid, a Spanish Jew of the early part of the eleventh century, who repeatedly endeavoured to explain difficulties on the assumption that letters had been confused or transposed, or that one word had been accidentally written instead of another. Yet he accepted the exegesis of the Targums, the Talmuds, and the Midrash, so that he cannot be described as a textual critic in the modern sense. He arrived at similar results, and by apparently similar methods, without fully realizing the significance of his suggestions. He was an unconscious pioneer. We mention last Saadia, who was born in the Fayum in 892 A.D., and became Gaon of Sura in 928 A.D., one of the most gifted and enlightened of the Jewish teachers of the Middle Ages. His Biblical exegesis rested on three pillars: tradition, Scripture, and reason. The interpretation of the Bible, he taught, can tolerate nothing that is unintelligible, nothing which is at variance with logical thinking. God's purpose in giving men the Law was to educate them as reasonable beings and to fit them for His service. Strange that Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages, whose very names are known to few outside of their own nation, should foreshadow in so many ways the achievements of Lessing, Ewald, Kuenen, and Wellhausen!

HARNACK ON THE NEWLY- DISCOVERED GOSPEL OF ST. PETER.—The weightiest contribution which has yet been made to the critical study of the

newly discovered Gospel of Peter and Revelation of Peter is contained in the latest number of the *Texts and Inquiries appertaining to the History of Early Christian Literature*, edited by Von Gebhardt and Harnack. The latter scholar has just published revised texts of these extremely interesting and valuable fragments, with a German translation and a commentary. We learn from the preface and from allusions scattered through the volume that, although a very short time has elapsed since the first publication of these strange relics of Christian antiquity, many scholars have already examined them and forwarded suggestions to the editor—among them Prof. Nestle, Prof. Wellhausen, the Bishop of Durham, and the late Dr. Hort—so that this pamphlet of less than a hundred pages represents far more than the opinions of an individual. The texts as given by Harnack correspond very closely in the main with those printed at the end of the Cambridge edition. The most noteworthy variations are the following:—1. Gospel 3 (of the English text). Those who have been scourging Jesus are represented as saying: "With this honour *have we honoured* (*ἐτιμώσαμεν* instead of *τιμώσωμεν*) the Son of God." 2. Gospel 8. The elders say to Pilate: "Give us soldiers that *we may guard* (*φυλάξωμεν* for *φυλάξωσιν*) his tomb for three days." 3. Gospel 9. The two angels of the resurrection are seen *approaching* (*ἐγγίζαντας* for *ἐκίσταντας*) the grave." 4. Gospel 10. The question put by a heavenly voice and answered by the cross is given thus: "Hast thou preached obedience to those that sleep?" If this is right, the similarity of these words in the Gospel of Peter to a well-known passage in the Second Epistle of Peter is so close as to suggest an intimate connection of some kind between the two documents. This is by far the most important reading in Harnack's text. 5. Revelation 5. The blessed in Paradise praise God in answering choirs (*ἀντενφύμουν* for *ἀνευφύμουν*). 6. Revelation 5 (end). "This is the place of your chief priests (*ἀρχιερέων* for *ἀρχέρων*), the righteous men." The date of the Gospel is put very early. Prof. Harnack is strongly disposed to believe that it was known to and used by Justin Martyr, that in fact it is one of the Apomneumata which he so often mentions, and concerning which there has been so much discussion. "Considering the fundamental importance of the question for the criticism of the Gospels," he writes, "I abstain from a final decision, but confess that at present I am not able to see how Justin's acquaintance with this Gospel can be disputed." If this use of it by Justin is admitted, the date of its composition cannot have been later than the first third of the second century. Concerning the relation of this new Gospel to the canonical Gospels, Harnack makes some very interesting and valuable remarks. It exhibits, in his opinion, affinities with all our Gospels, but it is not certain that any one of them was directly known to the writer. It is considered, however, to be proved, or almost proved, that he was acquainted with Mark. Use may have been made of a narrative closely related to Matthew's. The Gospel of Luke may have been employed, but our present evidence is insufficient to warrant a final verdict; and the dependence of "Peter" on the Gospel of

John has not yet been demonstrated, although there are some notable points of correspondence, particularly the statement that the crucifixion took place on the fourteenth of Nisan. The amount of fresh or divergent matter in the newly found document is shown to be considerable. The earlier portion which carries the narrative down to the resurrection exhibits twenty-nine peculiarities, and the remainder, though disfigured by obviously legendary elements, has some very remarkable features of its own, particularly the interposition of more than a week between the crucifixion and the first appearance of the risen Lord to His disciples, which is located not in Jerusalem, but in Galilee. The historical value of this Gospel, or rather of the fragment of it which has come down to us, is in all probability much overrated. "The story of the Passion," writes the Berlin Professor, "is told briefly and simply, and on the whole is little if at all inferior to the accounts in the canonical Gospels." In the reference to the first appearance of the risen Lord the Gospel of Peter is said to have followed a tradition which is older than Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and constitutes together with Paul's statement our best authority. This extravagantly high estimate of a confused and in parts fabulous story is not likely to find many to endorse it. None, on the other hand, will deny that it will be impossible in the future for critical students of the Gospels to leave this Gospel of Peter unnoticed. It may also perhaps be conceded that the problem of the Gospels is complicated rather than brought nearer solution by the new discovery, although some will not consider it certain that "it belongs to a period when the substance of the Gospels was still in a state of fusion." The home of "Peter" is thought to have been probably Syria, and the Gospel was written in the interest of a school or tendency, perhaps that represented by the Encratites. Traces of Docetism are less apparent to Harnack than to Mr. Robinson and Prof. Rendel Harris. The most important passage bearing on the subject—the statement that the crucified Jesus was silent as if feeling no pain—admits, it is shown, of a different explanation. The Gospel was not written for a sect, as is evident from the history of its use in the Church, but it contained Docetic and Encratitic features which caused it in later times to be regarded as heretical. The note communicated by Dr. Hort, which must have been penned very shortly before his decease, referred to the bearing of the new Gospel on the interpretation of a passage in the Gospel of John. We read there (xix. 13) that Pilate after leading Jesus out *ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ βήματος*, which is usually rendered "sat down on the judgment seat." The verb *καθίζω*, however, can also have a transitive meaning, "cause to sit," "seat," and was so translated in this place by the late Archbishop Whateley. In the new Gospel, as well as in a passage in the first Apology of Justin Martyr, which may have been more or less based upon it, the word is unmistakably transitive. The clause in the Gospel runs *ἐκάθισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ καθέδραν κρίσεως*, "they seated him on the seat of judgment." It is therefore highly probable, if not certain, that the corresponding clause in the fourth Gospel means that Pilate seated

Jesus in the seat of judgment as a part of the studied mockery by which he endeavoured to appease the ferocious mob thirsting for the prisoner's blood. This interpretation, which has hitherto obtained but little notice, the editors of the Variorum Bible, for instance, not deeming it worthy of insertion among various renderings, is now, thanks to this apocryphal fragment, endorsed by two of the ripest scholars of the century. The Apocalypse is assigned to the former half of the second century. It has points of contact with "the Shepherd" and "the Didache," and must have been in some way connected with the second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude. It is characterized by a curious blending of the Jewish-Christian spirit with antique ideas and images, and is of considerable interest for the student of Christian art and poetry. The apocalyptic "Peter" may be regarded as the precursor of "Virgil" and "Dante."

JER. xiii. 1-11.—It is very difficult to say whether the strange narrative recorded in this passage about burying the girdle in a cleft of the rock by the Euphrates is to be interpreted as a literal fact or not. The older commentators treat this, and similar accounts of symbolical teaching as real incidents, while in modern times the tendency has been to regard them as visions. In the third volume of the interesting and valuable series of books entitled *How to Read the Prophets*, the Rev. Buchanan Blake, B.D., gives in a very succinct form a good deal of help for the better understanding of the writings of the prophet Jeremiah. In treating of the above passage, he explains it as a literal act, and not as a vision, but he changes the scene from the Euphrates to Ephratah (the poetical name for Bethlehem). "The close relationship," he says, "in which God had been desirous to place Judah to Himself is clearly shown under the figure of the linen girdle. Had that remained pure, it might have remained for ever in use; but having become defiled, it was now to be cast aside. The prophet acted out this truth before the people, having taken a linen garment, such as is worn next the skin in the East, and deposited it in a hole near Jerusalem: when next taken out it was unfit for wear" (p. 203). In the text of the prophecy which Mr. Blake gives he substitutes Ephratah in each of the four places where Euphrates occurs. We think changes like this are utterly inexcusable: the proper place for merely conjectural emendations of the text is in notes upon it. Bochart was the first to suggest the reading Ephratah, and he has been followed by many recent scholars, but we are quite of Ewald's opinion that it is a mere fancy unworthy of serious consideration. The assertion that the Euphrates is usually designated as "the river" in Hebrew is contradicted by Gen. ii. 14 and Jer. li. 63, and we notice that in the latter passage Mr. Blake does not make or suggest any change in the rendering. Some support for the opinion that Jeremiah had really visited the land of the Chaldeans on the above occasion may be found in the fact that he was evidently known to the leading men in that country. Orders in his favour by Nebuchadnezzar (xxxix. 11) seem at any rate to imply some previous acquaintance with him.

THE STANDARD OF VERACITY AMONG THE JEWS.—In *The North American Review*, Mr. Gail Hamilton repudiates in a very spirited manner the statements made by Mr. Herbert Spencer in his *Principles of Ethics*, concerning the standard of morality among the Jewish people. Thus in the chapter on Veracity he says, "We have proof in the Bible that apart from the lying, which constituted false witness, and was to the injury of a neighbour, there was among the Hebrews but little reprobation of lying." Mr. Hamilton very pertinently remarks that the exception signified an immense advance on the other wild and semi-civilized tribes whose opinions and practices are cited in this connection. And he says, "If we, in the nineteenth century, lived up to the standard held aloft by this half-civilized people, if we had completely abandoned the sort of lying which this tribe distinguished itself from its neighbours by reprobating—lying to the injury of a neighbour—a large part of the machinery of our civilization might be allowed to fall into disuse." If Mr. Spencer had made no attempt to prove his statement it would have been somewhat difficult to decide as to its truth or falsity. But the quotations from the Bible adduced in support of it are so ludicrously inadequate as to leave on our minds an impression that after all it is possible that the philosopher is in the wrong. The first proof text is taken from 1 Kings xxii. 22, where it is said that Jehovah commissioned a lying spirit to deceive the prophets of Ahab and lead him to his ruin. Mr. Hamilton points out that this is simply a solemn warning in the guise of a parable to dissuade a rash king from going out to certain disaster. The whole burden of the tale is reprobation of lying. "These men, prophets?" says Micaiah in their very presence and in the presence of the allied kings: "then they are the prophets of a lying spirit, and not of the God of truth." It is an explanation fanciful in form, but embodying a real and deplorable truth. The incredible spectacle of four hundred pretended prophets leading a great king to his overthrow can only be explained by their being under Satanic influence. "Nor do we find the standard," says Mr. Spencer, "much changed in the days of Christ and after; instance the case of Paul, who, apparently rather piquing himself on his 'craft and guile,' elsewhere defends his act by contending that the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His glory" (Rom. iii. 7). The baselessness of the insinuation is at once apparent when we examine the passages in the writings of the Apostle here alluded to. In 2 Cor. xii. 16 he is defending himself against the charge of making gain out of the credulity of his converts. He had received no salary from the Corinthians, nor had he got any money from them in a crafty and underhand manner. For the sake of argument, he allows the charge, in order to see how it tallies with the facts. He is, in short, repudiating the statement that he had acted with "craft and guile." In Rom. iii. 7 he is quoting the supposed reasoning of a sophistical opponent in order to reprobate it. No one who looks into the passages quoted, and examines them in a fair and intelligent manner, can fail to see that they do not bear the construction Mr. Spencer has set upon them.

For once, at any rate, he has been caught napping. Philosophers and critics need to bear in mind that the same obligation rests upon them as upon other men, of knowing what they are talking about.

THE BOOK OF THE DEAD.—Dr. C. H. S. Davis, writing in *Biblia*, gives a description of the very curious literature of ancient Egypt, entitled the *Ritual*, or more correctly *The Book of the Dead*. An immense number of copies of this work are scattered among the various museums of Europe, and no fewer than fifty have been recently found at Thebes, and are now deposited at Boulak. Since the first copy was found in the Tombs of the Kings at Thebes this remarkable work has excited more than an ordinary amount of interest, but owing to imperfect knowledge of hieroglyphic writing, and the mystical nature of the text itself, a perfect translation has not yet been made. It is not a book in the usual sense of the word; it is not a literary whole, with a beginning, middle, and end, but is a mere unmethodical collection of religious compositions, as independent of each other as the Hebrew Psalms. Extracts from it were placed in the coffins of the dead, either on the inner side of the chests which held the mummies, or in the linen bandages in which the corpse was wrapped, or on the inner walls of the tomb, or sometimes on all three. *The Book of the Dead* was destined to instruct the soul in that which would befall it after death, and is a collection of prayers and incantations, which, while foretelling to him what would have to be passed through, also by their efficacy secured him against the dangers feared, and assured him the blessings desired. It was, according to Egyptian notions, an inspired work, and claimed to be a revelation from Thoth, or Hermes, who thought it declared the will of the gods. Portions of it are expressly stated to have been written by the very finger of Thoth himself, and to have been the composition of a great god. To the soul they assured a passage from the earth, a transit through the purgatory and other regions of the dead; the entrance through the empyreal gate by which the souls arrived at the presence of the sun; the admission into the orb of the sun; and protection from the various adversaries who sought to accuse, destroy, or detain the soul on its passage upwards. It is very singular that we find no trace of these ideas in the religious records of the Jewish people, to whom one would think they must have been very familiar during their residence in Egypt, especially when we consider the close affinity between many parts of the religious ritual of the two nations. It yet remains to be explained why so complete a silence should have been maintained in the Mosaic books on the condition of the soul after death.

TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.—In a very interesting pamphlet published by the *Catholic Truth Society* (London) Father M. Maher, S.J., gives an elaborate history of this celebrated work, from the first scattered notices of it down to the time (1888) when an Arabic version of the original was published from two newly-discovered MSS. From the references to the *Diatessaron* in the writings of the fathers, it was understood to be a harmony

of four Gospels; and as Tatian flourished at such an early period (c. A.D. 112-180), the question as to whether the four were our canonical narratives or not was of very great importance. The question was virtually answered in 1876 by the discovery of a commentary of Ephrem Syrus on the *Diatessaron*, from which an accurate idea of the original itself could be gathered. The phrases quoted and the incidents commented on fully proved that Tatian made use of the canonical Gospels, and of no other. The value of this early testimony to the authenticity of the sacred writings can scarcely be overestimated. The final stage in the almost romantic history of the *Diatessaron* consists in the discovery of the book itself in an Arabic version. Father Maher points out the significance of this recovery of Tatian's work in these terms: "In the first place, it establishes beyond the possibility of dispute henceforward that already in the middle of the second century—within fifty years of the composition of St. John's Gospel—our present four canonical Gospels held, in the universal esteem of the Church, an absolutely unique position, standing out in the boldest relief from all other writings dealing with our Lord's life. Secondly, through the extreme pains and care devoted by Tatian to preserve in his narrative even the most minute fragments and words of these Gospels, the *Diatessaron* proves that in the minds of the Christian world of that day every sentence and syllable, every jot and tittle of these Gospels possessed a peculiar sacredness, which distinguished them from all other human writings. Thirdly, this work presents new and powerful confirmatory evidence of the integrity of our present Gospels as regards their entire contents. For we find here, and therefore forming part of the received copies of the Gospels in Tatian's time, numerous passages attacked as interpolations by modern critics on more or less plausible grounds." It is to be noted, however, that the pericope John viii. 1-11 is not to be found in the *Diatessaron*. It contains both Mark xvi. 9-20 and John v. 4.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF EVANGELICALISM.

By REV. A. H. CRAUFURD.

MR. COTTER MORISON in his strange and futile book, "The Service of Man," especially singles out for severest condemnation the central core of Christianity, the Evangelical doctrines of the forgiveness of sins and of the possibility of genuine moral transformations of character, whether these doctrines are propounded by Mr. Spurgeon or by Dr. Pusey.

Reading Mr. Morison's book as a convinced Christian of the Broad Church school, I was most deeply impressed with a renewed sense of the vast moral power of the teaching so loathed by this stern philosopher. Towards the close of his volume this fierce opponent of our religion makes this pro-

foundly significant confession: "Nothing is gained by disguising the fact that there is no remedy for a bad heart, and no substitute for a good one." It is instructive to contrast this mournful and depressing admission with the buoyant and refreshing hopefulness that pervades the whole teaching of Jesus: "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." It was to the *lost* sheep that Christ felt that He was most truly sent. That the Divine Man, age after age, "receiveth sinners," ought not to be deemed a reproach to Him by a moralist who is reluctantly constrained to confess that he himself can do nothing for them.

Of course, if a man were perfectly dehumanized, if he had become a tiger or an ape, nothing short of a miracle could redeem him. But Mr. Morison was not speaking of such a case, but of the vast mass of ordinary sinners. I rather wonder whether this unrelenting and unhopeful philosopher ever heard of Charles Reade's wise and touching story, *It is Never Too Late to Mend*. Therein he might have seen those very processes of moral conversion being actually accomplished which he had pronounced to be impossible.

To me, at the present time, it appears that one of the bits of work best worth doing would be to detach the really saving and operative truths of Evangelical religion from the great mass of futile and repulsive absurdities in which they are now imbedded. The husk of what is commonly called Low Church Christianity is unsightly enough, but that is no real reason for casting away the kernel.

The work called *Lux Mundi* has shown us that the High Church party is drawing nearer to "Broad" ideas. And, in a similar way, I think that the marvellous popularity of Mr. Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* has testified to the fact that there is a widespread conviction that a *philosophy* of Evangelicalism, or a recasting of its fundamental doctrines, is a *desideratum*. But certainly intellectual redemption will not come by the methods used by Mr. Drummond. Philosophy cannot be satisfied or lured into allegiance either by the detection of fanciful analogies or by the quotation of irrelevant texts of the Bible.

On the whole, it seems to me that the intellectualizing of Evangelicalism, the rational statement of its deepest moral and spiritual ideas, is a far easier and more hopeful enterprise than a similar attempt with regard to High Church teaching would be. The seat of authority in religion is fundamentally the same in all sane Protestantism, whereas in Romanism and High Anglicanism it is widely different. The eyes of these latter religions are in the backs of their heads. Their favourite formula or war-cry, the "*Semper, ubique, ab omnibus*," is a kind of negation of progress, a declaration that their religion is essentially a quotation. They live by precedents. Thought in their case can never be adequately free. The *idea* of an Ecumenical Council, as a protest against the supposed decease of the Holy Spirit and the sealing up of the sources of inspiration, is excellent; but in *practice* such Councils are narrow, essentially sectarian, and unprogressive. The doctrine of development in the Church seems to open the way for the

reception of new truths, but the new truths almost always turn out to be only amplifications of old dogmas, devitalized petrifications dressed up in a modern garb, and vainly claiming affinity with modern thought. At the best, when baptizing new truths, the Church usually takes care to dwarf and distort them.

On the other hand, the best and finest sort of "Broad" religion appears in many ways to be a sort of Evangelicalism that has "come to itself," reconciled itself with reason, and learnt, like Paul, to "put away childish things." All genuinely Protestant thought is potentially "Broad."

Let us, therefore, inquire briefly as to what constitutes the moral force of Evangelical religion, wherein consist its chief defects, and how far the former can really be detached from the latter.

Now, to me it seems that the doctrine of the free forgiveness of sins, so far from being immoral in its results, as Mr. Cotter Morison declares it to be, is a vast storehouse of moral strength and renewal. Pardon is often far more truly remedial than punishment. Pity moves the heart of man incomparably more than bare justice ever does. Which of us does not perceive that Mrs. Browning's noble interpretation of the look which Jesus cast on cowardly Peter is the right one, and that the reproachful compassion of Christ, with its implicit promise of undying love, and its fine latent innuendo as to Peter's capacity for higher things, was a greater and more constraining moral force than any amount of merited denunciations could have been?

Truly, we often wish to turn our backs on our past lives, in some way to cancel them, and then to rise on our dead selves to higher things. And nature often freezes incipient penitence by her stern declaration of the irreparable consequences of bygone transgressions. Even fear of the better sort implies some dim faith in the Divine mercy, as the Psalmist perceived. The doctrine that "whatsoever a man soweth that"—and (by implication) nothing else—"shall he also reap," taken alone and without mitigation through co-operating sympathy, would, in a vast number of cases, fill the sinner only with the hopeless apathy of despair. The "eternal Gospel" of God's pitying Fatherhood is a necessary moral complement to the appalling sternness of the ethics of nature. Nature teaches fatalism. She denies that a man can redeem himself, and so she opens the way to religion with its doctrine of vicarious suffering and redemption wrought for us by a power higher than our own conscious selves. Since we cannot reconcile ourselves to God, if help is to come to us at all, it must come from God reconciling us to Himself. God must justify us or bring us into a right relation with Himself. The dislocated limb cannot restore itself.

Moreover, self-forgiveness is often exceedingly difficult. We often loathe ourselves. And here Evangelicalism often aids us greatly. Its doctrines of justification by faith and of imputed righteousness really mean justification by *anticipation*. That is the vital significance of these apparently irrational doctrines. God, the great Idealist of the universe, sees the glorious end even in the unpromising beginning, and is thus "satisfied," and loves His children,

not for what they actually are, but for what they have it in them to become. Thus we are potentially rich, whilst actually beggars. We are genuine "heirs" of the vast moral riches of God. What Jesus was on earth, that we are destined to be eventually. He is our ideal, the true self of each of us, the permanent root of our transient moral characters, at once a haunting reproach and a blessed encouragement, a secret "well of water" safe from all possible defilement, and springing up into life eternal.

The ways of the Eternal Spirit are full of surprises and paradoxes. Age after age "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise." Intellectually, the Evangelicalism of John Newton and of the poet Cowper had, to fastidious tastes, "nor form nor comeliness." Yet with the lowly *peasant* form of that despised religion it might well be thought that the Eternal Pity itself had freely communed, till its heart was on fire, and "burned" with quenchless moral enthusiasm. Sentiment, disdained by Rationalists of the shallower sort, and disdained also by High-and-dry divines, found a dwelling-place in the hearts and homes of simple-minded Low Church piety. And sentiment is, in reality, a far more potent moral force than mere reason.

Man's bodily ailments are often best ministered to by the tonic agency of poisons. And in the ethical and spiritual world the highest life is frequently quickened and invigorated by teaching usually stigmatized as dangerous and pernicious. Many a saint has been well nourished by abhorred heresies. Antinomianism has often been a source of sublime moral energy and power in the religious world. The very life of Evangelical teaching has frequently been in its supposed weakness. Mr. Cotter Morison attacks Mr. Spurgeon just where he was strong, viz., when he forgot all about his Judaic curses, and poured out love and compassion upon erring sinners. The words of the great Baptist preacher which so offended the strict moralist were these: "You great sinners shall have no back seats in heaven. There shall be no outer court for you. You great sinners shall have as much love as the best, as much joy as the brightest of saints. You shall be near to Christ."

Even so one thinks that "Dinah Morris" must have preached to sinful rustics. And who that knows anything of the heart of man can for one moment doubt that the fullest and freest declaration of God's fathomless love has, in millions of cases, touched and stirred the souls of the wicked, deep down in their very depths where no storms or thunderbolts of anathemas can ever reach? Perhaps the old story of the Prodigal Son is more efficacious as it is, with its tender and profoundly human antinomianism, than it would be if the father were made to go forth with his hands full of tracts about fire and worms, or dry treatises on the claims of an austere and pedantic justice. It is by loving the unworthy that we enable them to become good.

To the Evangelical party we all owe a great debt. It proclaimed the abiding love of God for sinners far more effectually than the old High-and-dry Anglican divines ever did, though I am thankful to say that some modern

Ritualists have learnt the secret which their predecessors ignored or despised. Refreshing, indeed, was the tender pity poured forth so freely over the unworthy in Cowper's hymns, when compared with the dry didactic wisdom contained in that most unimpressive book, once so widely read, *The Whole Duty of Man*. However much the old Low Church teachers may have erred in their views as to hell, to those within the fold, to those who accepted Christ, they were far more pitiful than High Anglican divines were. They *alone* in England, excepting perhaps a Unitarian here and there, fearlessly proclaimed the *unchanging* and *absolute* love of God and Christ, the great fact that "having loved His own, He loved them unto the end," that no sins caused Him to desert them. And in this fact was even then implicitly contained the "Broad" teaching as to universal salvation.

The High Church party were, and to a great extent still are, far too much inclined to overrate the moral efficacy of that "law" which St. Paul found so futile as a helper. We must work from within to without. Of what use are more laws if the same old law-breaker is to keep them? Did any one ever yet obtain strength in his legs by staring at a sign-post? Enthusiasm is more potent than any amount of laws; and enthusiasm or fervour such as that of Luther is often in direct antagonism with recognized law.

Hence we find that, even in our days, rational Evangelicalism is far more suited to meet the needs of very *vivid* natures than High Anglicanism is. It does not make authority so oppressive. It has more room for emotional and moral originality, even though these should be without precedent. It realizes far more than its old opponent does the apparent lawlessness of genuine emotional life, that "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth." It does not expect Divine grace to flow always in one appointed channel. In this respect Evangelical religion is more human and genuinely Catholic than High Church religion is. It is nearer to the "multitude" still leading the old instinctive life. Thus I have found by experience that it is more suited to soldiers with their strong feelings and their undeveloped intellects. Priestly theories also tend to diminish the sense of the radical oneness of human nature; they seem implicitly to deny that the whole world is kin. And so, in a very real sense, we may say that to be clerically minded is death and isolation, but to be humanly minded is life and fellowship.

The lofty spirituality of Low Church piety has also been a great power. High Church doctrines often seem a kind of denial of the fundamental truth that "the kingdom of God is within us." As an *ideal*, Quakerism is far higher than Sacramentalism. The seer in the Apocalypse saw no temple in the great realm of realities behind the veil. Evangelicalism is also free from the ludicrous teaching of the High Anglicans as to regeneration, though it has some errors of its own on this subject. It is free to join with Broad Church teachers in proclaiming the truth that Ecclesiasticism is a foe of true eligion, that the external and conventional are of only transient value, that

the soul is greater than any ordinances, and the Divine kingdom far larger than any existing Church. "God is a Spirit." The wish in some measure to localize the Divine operations seems to link High Church theology with its old enemies the English Deists, whose fatal belief it was that God's agency on earth is transitive and occasional, and not immanent and abiding. Even in the Roman Catholic Church a kind of semi-Evangelical mysticism has been to some extent a corrective of semi-Deistic errors.

The defects of ordinary Low Church religion are many, grave, and palpable. In the first place, its theory as to the subordination of reason and the plenary inspiration of that great library called the Bible is obviously absurd. Nothing can be plainer than that the Bible contains widely varying degrees both of intellectual and of moral insight. Inspiration was not given to fetter reason or cancel genius. On the contrary, it presupposed certain high mental and spiritual endowments. In the Bible we see the noblest thought *in the making*. Jesus, with His sublime faith in the infinitude of the soul of man, had evidently no belief whatsoever in the finality of any written revelation. For Him the Holy Ghost was neither dead nor dying. Throughout all ages He would have us keep open the avenues to higher knowledge, and resist the soul-cramping tyranny alike of Churches and of libraries. No inspired men care much for precedents. Very vivid moral and spiritual natures often rebel against a despotic Bible just as much as against a despotic Church. Luther found the Epistle of St. James quite as irksome as any Papal decrees.

That fine irony which pervades all human life seems often to concentrate itself in the history of religion. And thus we find in our own days the somewhat startling fact that the "good news" and the doctrine of eternal torments, though absolutely incompatible, are taken to be but two aspects of one revealed truth. "Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing." The old Jews were a little more consistent. They kept Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal separate. We need no more learned treatises about eternal torments. All free intellects perceive clearly what the instincts of the unsophisticated multitude feel strongly, viz., the truth that God cannot be at once love and hatred towards the same creatures. The way in which Evangelicals cling to the doctrine of eternal torments reminds one very much of the way in which the Jewish Christians clung to the faith of the damnation of the Gentiles. In both cases alike the letter of the Bible favoured the narrower view, and the whole genius of the religion clamoured loudly for the broader one.

Evangelicalism must also learn to be more natural and less mournful, if it would remain a real moral power. The austere sectarian gloom of Puritanism was utterly alien from the very genius of Jesus, who loved nature and the simple human instincts of our race. The erroneous idea of the early Christians, that the end of the world was immediately coming, has darkened and impoverished the life of Christendom long enough. To redeem and ennoble the world is a better work than to frown on it. Whilst astronomy

has lessened the apparent importance of our planet, *time* has vastly enhanced its significance as the scene of a gloriously progressive moral education for hundreds or thousands of generations of noble spirits. To St. Paul this world appeared as an evanescent vestibule of the great hall of judgment. To us it is a grand and enduring university for souls. And so our Bibles cannot be to us merely railway guides to another world.

One of the very greatest hindrances to the efficiency of Evangelical teachers in the past has been their strange lack of all sense of humour. They must learn to laugh with those that laugh, if they would really influence mankind.

The Low Church teaching as to man's total depravity and as to the nature of conversion has been, and still is, false and misleading, as well as morally discouraging. Evangelicalism must study psychology more carefully. It must learn that man's *whole being* is indeed "an awful place," that God besets us "behind" as well as before, that the Infinite lurks even in the rudest forms of nascent heroism and unselfishness, that God's immanent agency stretches down to the very roots of our nature, and plants the germs of loftiest sanctity amidst the blindly groping primal instincts of our pilgrim race. The true regeneration is profoundly natural. It "cometh not with observation." This "miracle" does *not* mean "monster." It is "one with the blowing clover and the falling rain." The ways of the Eternal Spirit are finer and more subtle than ecclesiastics perceive. The High Church doctrine of baptismal regeneration is but a coarse travesty of an inward and essential verity, a mimicry of hidden vital processes by a materialistic mechanicalness. And the Low Church teaching of sudden conversion through terror and alarm is but an expression of man's spiritual incompetence to discern the indwelling Divine activity touching, to fine issues, with master hand, those glorious potential faculties which, like the material atoms, are never really stagnant and at rest, but throbbing with the vitalizing force of an imperceptible inspirer. The doctrine of God's *occasional* presence in man's soul seems to imply and emphasize the fact of His habitual absence.

Mr. Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, though interesting and suggestive in many ways, only deepens the early darkness of Evangelicalism as to conversion. This writer makes the great gulf between the converted and unconverted greater than ever. He teaches that there is as much or more difference between the finest characters in the natural world and the lowest in the spiritual world as there is between a stone and a plant. Obviously such doctrine is ethically and spiritually fatal. It is but a pseudo-scientific rehabilitation of the old soul-depressing Calvinism. No truly philosophical observer can receive such doctrine; and its religious effects can only be deplorable. It gives men a perfectly valid and logical excuse for neglecting religion. Their only strength henceforth is to sit still. In his desire to differentiate spiritual life, Mr. Drummond has hopelessly limited its area, and has totally ignored the plain Biblical declaration that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from

the Father of lights." God paints the wayside flowers of the moral and spiritual worlds quite as truly as He paints the glorious pageantry of their sun and moon and stars. To ignore God's homelier activities, whilst marvelling at His prodigies, is assuredly to exhibit the innate vulgarity of shallow and unbelieving belief.

Evangelical religion must also, if it wish to survive, reshape its doctrine of the atonement, and drive the money-changers out of its temple. Once more the glorious sacrifice of Christ must be brought into closest harmony with human heroism and disinterested love. Theories of the atonement and schemes of salvation—as if the power of God were sorely hampered by the evil one—do not help us in the least. The simple faith of our Lord's earliest followers, the sublime conviction that "the Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep," is what we really need. All else on this subject is but verbiage, or the ambitious systematizing of ignorant children. We know that Jesus came to reconcile us to the Father, and that is enough. In His wounds all human sorrows can hide themselves.

Low Church religion has in past times been terribly coarsened by its semi-commercial theories as to the atonement. The noblest of all moral qualities, disinterestedness, has been in great measure denied to God and altogether denied to man. The one was represented as rigidly demanding the very fullest compensation—as if any addition *could* be made to His infinite riches—and the other as stoutly stickling for his bond. Assuredly George Eliot was quite right in exposing the coarse selfishness of the religion of Dr. Cumming and the poet Young. A goodness that is devoid of generosity is no real goodness. In our days we are learning a deeper moral philosophy than that of Paley and his school. We perceive that disinterested admiration and keen sympathy are the very best and most operative ingredients of man's higher life. These influence the heart and soul down to their very depths, whereas fear and prudential self-regard touch only the *surface* of our spiritual nature.

Lastly, I quite believe that the illumination of Evangelical religion is perfectly possible, that its deep and pathetic moral and spiritual truths can be detached from its disfiguring errors. It will then be the same, and yet not the same, as it was, just as the true but cramped hearts of the earlier Christians were enlarged and altered by the subsequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The religion of Erskine of Linlathen, of Maurice, and of Robertson, was but the old tender religion of the poet Cowper after it had been enlarged by listening to those "many things" which age after age the Spirit of Jesus has to say to those prepared to "bear them." If Evangelicalism will but arise and shine now that its light has come, if it will welcome reason, if it will discern in altruism a nearer approach to the sacred character of Jesus, and in universalism a more adequate interpretation of His undying love; if it will put on henceforth the glorious apparel of a disinterested devotion to goodness and a profound faith in humanity and its splendid destiny; if it will frankly abandon the provisional Judaic teaching of Moses

and Elias, and be content to commune with the universal Spirit of Jesus only, then it may fearlessly chant its "Non Omnis Moriar," even now in the days of its apparent decrepitude, and the hellish gates of a devastating Atheism shall not prevail against it. For man cannot live long on mere negations. Till man's mind shall cease to wonder, till man's spirit shall cease to aspire, till man's heart shall cease to ache and yearn, Jesus the revealer of God's moral wisdom and the very incarnation of God's deathless pity, Jesus the very prototype of all true Evangelicals, will live, and breathe, and energize in our struggling, complex, and most miraculous nature. "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" Not in the Judæa of withered and decaying dogmas, but in the free Galilee of a broadly human fellowship, shall we most truly find that great Interpreter and Master of the soul of man, who, age after age, dies in order that He may more really live, sheds the transient that He may disclose the eternal, and through the very grave and gate of death, through black abysses of despair and unbelief, leads His astonished followers on to nobler heights of knowledge and more glorious worlds of love.

BIBLICAL THOUGHT.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

By REV. J. E. H. THOMSON, B.D.

THE two opposed views of the date of the Book of Daniel involve opposed views of its structure. It is clear that if the ordinarily received critical date of Daniel—the age of the Maccabees—be accepted as true, then the book must be regarded as a work of imagination, a sacred romance written for the purpose of encouraging the Israelitish people in their resistance to the Hellenic kingdom of Syria. It follows from this that there is no prophecy in the ordinary sense of the word in Daniel, that the appearance of prophecy is merely a literary device to bring the lessons from the events alleged to have occurred in Babylon during the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar and of Darius the Mede into line with the times and struggles of the Maccabees.

The orthodox traditional view of Daniel is that it recounts events that really occurred at the time and in the connection in which they are recorded. This view necessitates the maintenance of a date for Daniel much earlier than critics would agree to. Many of the orthodox traditional school have gone further, and seem to think there is no possibility that those who oppose them have any claim to the title Christian, that the denial of the historicity of Daniel involves the denial of inspiration, of miracles, of prophecy, and of the Christian faith generally.

This attitude is at once unfair and unwise; unfair, because many maintain Daniel to be a historical novel, and yet maintain that the Divine Spirit

inspired the author to write this book as the author of Job, that yet greater work, was inspired for his task; unwise, because it involves the essentials of the faith in regard to a matter that in itself, at all events, is not essential. The evidence of the Lord's resurrection is one thing, and evidence for the date of Daniel is a totally different thing. It is a matter simply for scientific investigation. Of course, the rationalistic critics are in many instances as unfair and yet more unwise. They answer arguments at times merely by supercilious sneers, and that is unfair; and it is unwise tacitly to assume principles of judgment which, if carried out to their legitimate conclusion, involve consequences not dreamt of by many of their supporters.

It seems a comparatively simple matter, and certainly it is an obviously necessary one, to see what might be reasonably expected to be the characteristics of such a religious romance as Daniel is supposed by critics to be. In doing so, we must bear in mind it is a religious romance with a definite purpose, and that purpose, we are assured, was to stimulate the courage of the Jews against Epiphanes. If the Book of Daniel is a romance of that kind, it must manifest the characteristic features of such romances. Human nature is, in the main, the same in all ages; and the laws of composition, therefore, must be essentially the same also.

The primary characteristic that, as a work of fancy and of art, such a romance must necessarily present is *unity*. This unity must be obvious and striking, for the vogue the Book of Daniel gained so shortly after its publication—if it was published in the days of the Maccabees—proves it, if a romance, to have been a consummate work of art. It not only was received by the Essenes, who dealt in apocalyptic literature, and led them further in their course of apocalyptic composition, but gained the favour of the Pharisees and Sadducees. The Pharisees were full of Messianic enthusiasm, but very soon broke from the Hasmonians; the Sadducees had no Messianic hopes, but supported John Hyrcanus and the later Hasmonians; yet both acknowledged Daniel. Its artistic power must have been great to have bridged over such oppositions. But artistic power is manifested by the springing up of imitations. The whole range of apocalyptic literature is due to Daniel. As a work of art, unity must be its first characteristic.

But it may be objected that the Koran has had immense influence, and no one can accuse it of being a unity; nay, no one can say that more than a minority of the *suras* are unities. Of course, as a matter of literary history the origin of the present Koran by the editing of the confused fragments left by Mohammed easily explains the want of unity; but the reason of the popularity, despite this, is to be found in the unique personality of Mohammed. Had Mohammed merely written the Koran, and had he been nothing more than its author, the Koran would never have been known beyond Mecca in point of space, or the generation of Mohammed in point of time.

On the other hand, unity is not necessary to the popularity of a record of facts. If in the time when the mind of a community is yet heaving with emotion, the facts connected therewith are put on record, then the book

narrating these facts may become popular, although it has no artistic unity. Thus the *Scots Worthies*, written by Howie of Lochgiel, the Covenanter, was so popular in the end of last century as to be in almost every cottage in Scotland; yet it has no literary quality whatever, but is a record of facts that had been centres of emotion in a generation but just passed away.

Let us now see whether there are any tokens of this unity in the Book of Daniel. This unity must be a unity of a purpose which shall be obvious in every part of the book. To that purpose every portion of the whole must be subordinated. The purpose assigned by critics is certainly an adequate one, the encouragement of the Jews in their struggle against Epiphanes. Nebuchadnezzar is said to be the representative of Epiphanes, and the lycanthropy of the former a reference to the punning nickname *Epimanes*, given by the Antiochian mob to this king—the fact that Nebuchadnezzar associated with the beasts pointing to Epiphanes associating with low companions. If this be the case, certainly there is an adequate purpose, and the central figure, one suited to sustain the stress of being the proof of this unity, the centre round which the parts revolve. But does careful study of the book bear out this view? We, for our part, think not.

It is quite true that in the first four chapters Nebuchadnezzar is the central figure, but he disappears in the fifth chapter, and Belshazzar reigns in his stead, either as king or deputy-king; while in the sixth chapter we have Darius the Mede on the throne. The latter six chapters are all visions, and not one of them is even dated as in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. If, however, we restrict ourselves to the chapters in which Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned, do we find any parallelism between the character ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar and that of Epiphanes, or any similarity between the feelings excited by the character of Nebuchadnezzar and those excited by the character of Epiphanes? Take the character first. Certainly Nebuchadnezzar was arbitrary and imperious, but that is merely saying that he was an Oriental monarch. There is nothing small or pitiful in his character. We can never think of the Nebuchadnezzar of Daniel throwing aside the cares of empire in order to boose with mechanics. That is recorded of Epiphanes by Polybius. The back of Epiphanes is always ready to cringe to the Romans, if his hands are ready to tear in cruelty races subject to him, but there are no signs of cringing in Nebuchadnezzar. Again, no one can fail to notice how sensitive Nebuchadnezzar is to the spiritual influences. The interpretation of his dream at once brings to his lips the confession of the greatness of Jehovah. The deliverance of the three Hebrew children deepens the conviction he has, and leads to a stronger acknowledgment of it. When he recovers from his lycanthropy he practically acknowledges himself a worshipper of Jehovah. No one would accuse Epiphanes of any such sensitiveness. Any one who asserts an identity between the character of Epiphanes and that ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar must do so in defiance of fact, simply because his theory demands it.

Let us now compare the feelings excited in the Jews by the one and the other as exhibited in the Book of Daniel. We here assume, for the sake of argument, the critical position that Daniel was written in the days of the Maccabees. Let us, then, see how the writer describes Epiphanes. In the eleventh chapter, twenty-first verse, he is described as "a vile person," נִקְיָא one despised. No one can say that Nebuchadnezzar is so represented in Daniel. When he interprets Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the four empires, Daniel says, "Thou art this head of gold." The monarch whose symbol was the "golden head" could never be the symbol of the vile person. The power and character of Nebuchadnezzar are represented as having impressed Daniel so much that he regards him as the most godlike of monarchs. When again Daniel stands before Nebuchadnezzar to interpret to him the dream that foretells his lycanthropy, Daniel is overwhelmed with sorrow, and says, "My lord, let the dream be on them that hate thee, and the interpretation on thine enemies." It cannot be said this is due merely to Eastern courtliness, because in the very next chapter Daniel takes up a totally different attitude in regard to Belshazzar. He, the captive counsellor, has a love for the grand impulsive despot. No Jew could have that feeling toward Epiphanes, the despised person who obtained the kingdom by flatteries. As a matter of fact, I do not think the eleventh chapter to be part of the original Book of Daniel, but I do think it was written during the time of the Maccabees. As such it gives the impression made by Epiphanes on contemporary Jews. To assert that Nebuchadnezzar is intended to represent Epiphanes is simply to deny facts. There is, therefore, no unity so far as the central character is concerned.

Another idea is that the history of Daniel as a romance is modelled on the history of Joseph. Certainly both Joseph and Daniel are captives, both dream and interpret dreams, and both are raised to high estate. But a little careful consideration will show the essential differences subsisting, which put in the shade these superficial points of resemblance. As we learn from the 105th psalm, and from Stephen's speech, Acts vii., two points in the history of Joseph impressed the Jews—the fact that his brethren who had sold him for a slave had accepted benefits from his hands, and that his captivity in Egypt was intended by God to further the deliverance of His people ultimately. In neither of these points is there any resemblance to what occurred to Daniel. The temptation would have been considerable to a romance writer of the age of the Maccabees to give his hero a prominent share in the return from Babylon, seeing there was a Daniel who did occupy a prominent position as we see from Ezra viii. 2. Although, according to present punctuation, he is called the head of the sons of Ithamar, if we neglect this, he might as naturally be regarded as the head of the sons of David. If it be objected that the date of Ezra rendered it impossible for Daniel to have been living then, it must be answered, No one who knows anything of Jewish literature would believe that any Jewish romance writer would regard that as an obstacle. He would either have made Daniel live a couple of centuries, or have ignored

the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyses, and Xerxes. Such accuracy is not after the manner of the Jews. Nor can we avoid noticing the fact that while Joseph is made the *second* person in the kingdom, Daniel is only made the *third*. This, however, we would not press.

If we look at the purpose assigned to the book—strengthening the courage of the Jews in the struggles against the Seleucid kingdom—and regard it as a piece of rhetoric, do we find it eminently suited for its purpose? I confess I do not think so. Rebellion against Epiphanes and resistance to his commands was the duty impressed upon the Jews by Mattathias and his sons. There is no hint at rebellion against Nebuchadnezzar being ever contemplated. We could have imagined how a stirring story could have been composed which should have shown how the armies of Nebuchadnezzar were foiled and overthrown by the valour of Israel under the direction and with the help of Israel's God. It might have shown that weak instruments might be chosen for this end, so that Jewish valour was, so to say, put to the one side; but discomfiture of armies must have formed a marked portion of the narrative. We see the kind of thing that would have been produced if this purpose had been the formative cause of Daniel in the Apocryphal Book of Judith. Every critic regards that book as the product of a period of struggle, and intended for the encouraging of the combatants on the side of the holy people, whether we place it as early as the Maccabean conflict or as late, with Volkmar, as the days of Bar-coch-ba. And it was eminently fitted to encourage combatants engaged in a struggle like that of the Maccabees.

Had the assumption been that Daniel was composed of real historical incidents selected with a view to a given purpose, there might be less of unity than in a work of fiction. The unity would be even less if the incidents were selected and arranged, not with any general purpose, but simply from the recognition of something interesting and striking in the incidents themselves. In such a case a book with little artistic unity might have great popularity. Few books, as we have said, have less claim to be artistic than Howie's *Scots Worthies*, yet few religious books are as popular in Scotland. The popularity of this book was due to this—that it was fact, not imagination. Judging by the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, the Book of Judges was much more inspiring than the Book of Daniel. The aged Mattathias certainly quotes Daniel on his death-bed as an encouragement to his sons, but a little consideration will show, although this was the case, the instances chosen were not naturally fitted for the purpose designed, and therefore evidently, as we hope later to show, those actually used by the dying priest.

Further, there are certain negative characteristics, the want of which at once puts a book outside the pale of art. If the book is to be an artistic work, it must have no *obvious* contradictions. We use the word "obvious" advisedly. There may be contradictions which the minute critic may discover by comparing portion with portion; if these, however, do not obtrude themselves on the ordinary reader, the work is none the less artistic. Some

critic has discovered that in *Nicholas Nickleby*, between two meetings of the hero and his sister, the one passes through three weeks, the other as many months. The work is none the less artistic because of this inaccuracy, for the contradiction would not be noticed by any one who was not intent on making a chronology of the novel in question.

On the other hand, history may show what appear glaring contradictions, yet fulfil its functions, provided there may be some way out of the apparent contradictions. Thus Guizot, in his *English Revolution of 1640*, after giving an account of how December, 1648, was spent in preparing for the trial of Charles, brings us, without warning, into January, during which the trial actually took place, followed by the execution of the unfortunate monarch. He proceeds then to tell us that on the lid of the coffin was this inscription, "Charles Rex, 1648." This seems an obvious contradiction, till we remember that in those days, in England, the civil year began on March 25th.

One of the alleged self-contradictions in the Book of Daniel is that while in the first chapter, verse 21, we are told Daniel continued until the first year of Cyrus, in the first verse of the tenth chapter we have the third year of Cyrus dated from When we learn that Cyrus was two years king of Nations before he assumed the title king of Babil, the first chapter states the termination of Daniel's life according to the chronology of Babylon, whereas in the tenth chapter Cyrus is dated from as king of Nations. Thus the contradiction is removed. The Book of Daniel in this respect is more like a historic work than a work of fiction.

Another negative characteristic we may notice, but only notice, is that no successful work of fiction ever was composed in two languages. Historic works often contain in notes or appendices—devices unknown for centuries after Daniel—long portions in various languages different from that in which the main body of the book is written. It is notorious that the Book of Daniel is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic. Of course every one is aware of the various reasons assigned for this twofoldness of the Book of Daniel. Yet if the introduction of Aramaic was due to the destruction of exemplars so that of six chapters only an Aramaic version remained still, as the popularity of Daniel was achieved when it had been thus mutilated, the peculiarity we have referred to yet remains. If it is a work of imagination, it is unique; it was written in two languages, and was yet popular.

Further, it seems difficult to conceive a work of imagination composed in two separate divisions, the one historic and written of the man who gives the name to the book, the other visionary and purporting to be written by him under whose name it goes. It seems difficult to conceive any way better fitted to dissolve all unity than this. It seems impossible to think that any writer capable of composing the visions of Daniel could have been so blind to the defects of such a method. The phenomena in question, that is to say the two chronologically arranged series, the one biographical, containing incident, and the other prophetic, containing visions, could be explained on Dr. Wright's hypothesis, with variations, that our Daniel is an epitome of

two works, one a biography, the other an apocalypse; or, as it seems to us, more easily explicable on the theory that Daniel was originally composed in "broadsheets," and then collected, much as Mohammed's Koran was collected.

Another point to be noted is that the more rigid the unity in a work, the less liable is it to interpolation; but the less of a unity it is, the more is it liable to suffer from false additions. The symmetry of the 119th psalm has preserved it from interpolation; on the other hand, no book has suffered nearly as much as the *Oracula Sibyllina*. No Biblical book has suffered nearly so much from the hands of the interpolators as has the Book of Daniel.

Another line of investigation may be taken. When a pseudepigraphon was published, the name annexed to it had usually something either from its meaning or from its historic connotation which afforded a starting-point for the book in question. Let us see whether on any of these grounds there is a reason for the name Daniel being ascribed to the book.

Let us look at the name. It is certainly a significant name, but that is not saying much, as all Hebrew names were significant. It may mean either "God is my Judge," or, following the analogy of Gabriel (גַּבְרִיאֵל), it may mean "the Divine Judge." If the contents of the book fitted either of these significations, something might be said for it being a fictitious composition. On the hypothesis that the first exhibits the true meaning of the name, the only incident that seems to fit this significance is the story of Daniel in the lions' den, related in the sixth chapter. Even it, however, does not so clearly exhibit this as might have been expected. The incident rather shows God's defence of His faithful servants than His vindication of their righteousness, which certainly is the characteristic of the Divine nature suggested by this interpretation of the name Daniel.

On the other supposition that Hitzig's suggestion is correct, that the name Daniel means "the Judge of God," "the Divine Judge," then there is no portion of the canonical Daniel which has any trace that the name on this hypothesis had anything to do with the structure of the book. The story of "Susanna and the Elders" at once shows the kind of thing that would be produced by the imagination acting merely on the name. This story suits the name Daniel so admirably that M. Renan is sure that this represents the original form of the Daniel legend. That, however, is a mere travesty of criticism. The canonical book has no trace of being written up to the name Daniel in this latter sense.

If, however, we take the later Jewish apocalypses, and guide our expectations by them, we should expect to find that Daniel was a very noted man, one to whom revelations had, according to Scripture or tradition, been made. The most noted of these apocalyptic books is the Book of Enoch. Tradition and Scripture had alike pointed him out as one who had received revelations. Noah was a preacher of righteousness, and had it revealed to him that the flood was coming, hence the composition of those Noachian fragments included in the second Book of Enoch. Adam, the first father of the race, had revelations made to him: hence we have the Testament of

Adam. There were also Testaments of Abraham and of the twelve patriarchs. No man had more revelations made to him than Moses, so we find the Apocalypse or Assumption of Moses. We might go on to speak of the Psalter of Solomon, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Apocalypse of Elijah; all these bear out our contention that the men in whose name these apocalypses were composed were men of mark. When we turn to the few references to Daniel outside the Book of Daniel, there seems nothing to suggest such a character as a suitable one to affix revelations to.

There is no doubt that there was a person, actual or legendary, named Daniel—the references in Ezekiel prove this. If we find the characteristics assigned to Daniel in Ezekiel are such as are fitted to suggest the incidents and visions of the Book of Daniel, then a fair case might be made out that it was the product of a *falsarius*. We do not in the first instance consider the question of the actuality of Daniel, but only the character attributed to him by Ezekiel. The first thing to be noted is that Daniel is placed along with Noah and Job, and the three reckoned so supremely righteous men that their presence might have been supposed to guarantee the safety of Jerusalem if they had been in it (Ezek. xiv. 14, v. 20). While there is nothing in the Book of Daniel to contradict this view, and much to confirm it, there is nothing to indicate that it has been written with a view to illustrate this. The story of the three Hebrew children may be regarded as the greatest exhibition of righteousness, but Daniel has neither part nor lot in their trial. In Ezek. xxviii. 3 super-eminent wisdom is ascribed to Daniel. In this chapter the prophet is engaged in denouncing the iniquities of Tyre in the person of its angel prince. He says, "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret they can hide from thee." What was the Jewish notion of wisdom, חכמה, at the time when critics say Daniel was composed? Slightly earlier than the date to which Daniel is assigned was written Ecclesiasticus, and shortly after the Wisdom of Solomon. In neither of these books is there any hint that apocalyptic visions had anything to do with wisdom in these books, as in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are sententious statements of the dictators of prudence. In Job wisdom means the discussion of intricate questions; but that it should mean apocalyptic, this is a new thing. Certainly the interpretation of visions was part of wisdom, but not the only portion. What is said of the Prince of Tyrus, "No secrets they can hide from thee," would rather point to the power of reading riddles, which, as all know, was regarded as a leading test of wisdom in the East. But there is nothing of that sort in our Book of Daniel. It is evident, then, that the Book of Daniel was not written up to the reputation of the man.

Before leaving this, we may look at the question of the date at which the man Daniel referred to by Ezekiel actually lived. Certainly the fact that his name is introduced between Noah and Job would seem to indicate that Daniel was regarded as having lived in a period remote from himself; but it does not necessarily do so. When in any way a contemporary rises

head and shoulders above his fellows, there is a tendency to couple his name not with those of his contemporaries who approach most nearly to him in talent, power, or influence, but rather with the worthies of a bygone age. Instances will easily suggest themselves; not only so, but in states of high excitement even lesser men have a halo thrown round them.

Consider the unique position occupied by Daniel according to the Book of Daniel. He, captive as he is, is raised by his talents and probity to the head of all the wise men of Babylon, to be something not unlike the Chancellor of the Empire in Germany. Would his fellow-captives dwelling by the river Chebar not be prone to exaggerate even the power and importance of their great compatriot, and compare him with such men who had lived aforetime? His youth, so far from lowering him in the minds of his contemporaries, was more likely to heighten the impression made by his rapid elevation.

Leaving the question of the author, a problem difficult of solution is the reason of the two languages used in Daniel. The phenomena are certainly peculiar. Not only is the first chapter of Daniel in Hebrew, but the second chapter opens as if the author intended to write in Hebrew throughout; but in the fourth verse it abruptly said, "Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syriack"; and thereafter the book, to the end of the seventh chapter, is written in Chaldee. With the eighth chapter begins the Hebrew anew, and is continued to the end of the book. There are several theories advanced to explain this.

1. There is the theory of Lenormant, supported, with some slight variation, by Mr. Bevan. It is that originally the whole book was written in Hebrew, but that the portion extending from ii. 4 to the end of vii. had been lost, but that an Aramaic version had been preserved of the missing portion, and that this was inserted in the place in manuscripts where the blank occurred. He explains the word אֲרָמִית as merely a note placed originally at the margin of a manuscript to indicate that at this point the Aramaic began, which slipped into the text through the mistake of a copyist. He has the same theory as to the force of the word אֲרָמִית in Ezra iv. 7. Bevan explains the loss of the Hebrew by the efforts of Epiphanes to destroy all the sacred writings of the Jews. Since Daniel was not inserted in the regular synagogal readings, there were relatively few copies extant, and therefore, he argues, it might easily happen that only one exemplar survived, and it defective. He thinks the author probably wrote two versions of his book, one in Hebrew and the other in Aramaic.

Certainly, in favour of this view is the accidental, hap-hazard way in which the Aramaic enters the narrative. Further, there is the fact that in the Talmud the Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra are called *Targum*. However, we must not assume that this meant that the opinion of the Talmudists coincides with that of Lenormant and Mr. Bevan. They simply meant that these portions of Daniel and Ezra were written in Aramaic, the language of the *Targums*, hence they maintained that, although Targum, they "defiled the hands," i.e., were canonical. Further, against this opinion is

the repugnance there was to commit to writing any translation or Targum of the Scripture. We all know that it was probably two centuries after the time of our Lord before the Targum of Onkelos—the earliest of the Targums—was committed to writing. Mr. Bevan's hypothesis of the author himself making an Aramaic version seems devoid of probability, as it certainly is devoid of proof. It seems scarcely likely that any one would desire to palm off "Daniel" as a veritably ancient and sacred book, and yet lessen its sanctity by translating it into Aramaic.

2. There is, next, the theory of Eichhorn, adopted, with variations, by Meinhold, that the Aramaic portion is by a different author from the Hebrew. Meinhold regards the seventh chapter as due to the author of the Hebrew. On any hypothesis of the relative date of the two portions of the Book of Daniel, it seems strange. On Meinhold's hypothesis, that the Aramaic portion is the older by a century and a half, it is difficult to understand why the book was originally written in Chaldee; and, in the next place, it is still more difficult to understand why an imitator who could pen the seventh chapter should depart from his model so far as to write all but the seventh chapter in Hebrew. This latter applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the opposite hypothesis that the Hebrew portions are the older.

3. Another theory is that the difference of language represents difference in date. It is maintained that the Aramaic portions were written—for this view is traditional—under the Babylonian supremacy; the Hebrew under the Persian. The fatal objection to this view is the fact that the eighth chapter, which narrates the vision of the ram and the he-goat, is dated in the reign of Belshazzar, but is written in Hebrew, while the incident of Daniel in the den of lions occurred when Darius the Mede was king. The framers of this explanation have failed to note that there are two columns of dates—one applying to incidents ending with the sixth chapter, the other of visions beginning with the seventh chapter.

4. Merx, according to Lenormant, advances another theory. He maintains that the difference in language was due to the different audience contemplated. Where the contents were relatively simple and suited for the ordinary Jewish society, the language used was Aramaic, the language of commerce and of social intercourse at the time in Babylon. On the other hand, where the visions were more recondite, they were recorded in Hebrew, the language of the learned class. There is certainly a probability that during their captivity the Jewish people were gradually learning the common tongue of Babylon, and losing command of the sacred tongue. It is also certain that Hebrew was kept up by some, probably a learned class. But, waving the question as to whether Daniel is written in Eastern or Western Aramaic, Lenormant's answer seems sufficient. The first chapter, which is simply narrative and therefore by hypothesis fitted for the common people, is written in Hebrew; whereas the account of the five beasts, which is certainly as recondite as the account of the combat of the ram and the he-goat, is written in Aramaic. Moreover, there is no proof offered that a

learned class had reached such a definite development as to suggest the use of a different language for them.

5. The view supported by Dr. Pusey and Prof. Keil is that the difference of language is due to a difference of reference. Prophecies that affected the heathen primarily, and the great world-empires, were couched in Aramaic, while visions that referred to the people of God were written in Hebrew. One objection to this view is that it takes no account of narrations. Thus the first chapter, which recounts the training of Daniel and his three companions, is in Hebrew, while the third chapter, which recounts the constancy of the three companions, is in Aramaic. But even in regard to prophecies it is difficult to see on what grounds it can be maintained that the seventh chapter with its account of the four monarchies is more applicable to the heathen world than the eighth chapter with its account of the combat and empires of the ram and the he-goat.

6. The theory of the origin of Daniel which Dr. Wright has indicated in his Introduction to the Old Testament, as that of his forthcoming Commentary, necessitates a special theory of the origin of the two languages. Dr. Wright regards the canonical Book of Daniel as an epitome from a larger work, much as Kings and Chronicles are epitomes. No one who considers the phenomena of the book can fail to see a good deal that is at least plausible in this view. He has given no hint as to how he deals with the question of the two languages. It would seem the most natural way would be to hold that there were two works by Daniel, one in Aramaic and the other in Hebrew, and that one canonical book was an epitome of both; the epitome and extracts from the Aramaic book being in Aramaic, while the Hebrew was epitomized in Hebrew. The main difficulty one feels in adopting the theory of Dr. Wright is that the epitome does not follow the method adopted by the writers of Kings and Chronicles. In Kings and Chronicles intervals of time are bridged over by a sentence or two, in the most compendious method certainly, but still the space is bridged over; but in Daniel there is no attempt to bridge over omitted spaces. Further, the phenomena of the Chigi version are not explicable on that principle.

7. The phenomena presented by the text of the Codex Chisianus as compared with that of the Masoretic has suggested to me another solution of the problem of the two languages, and of the problem of the structure of Daniel. As our readers may remember, the Septuagint Greek differed in some chapters from the Masoretic text in a way that indicated that the received Masoretic-Hebrew text had been interpolated, while in other cases the Chigi seems to have suffered from the interpolators. Such a state of matters indicates, as we said in our former article, that the portions of which our Daniel is composed were published as tracts, and had an individual history external to the collection which forms our canonical book. We would suggest this theory with all diffidence. Should it be urged that the fact that the book according to both recensions contains practically the same portions, we have only to imagine that although the collection of these pamphlets

was practically made from a pure text, the facts were floating about independently, and were getting additions made to them, and thus these additions were inserted into the Masoretic text. Other additions were made to another set of manuscripts, and these additions were transferred to the Chigi. Some of these sacred tracts were in Hebrew, and others in Aramaic, and in the main the Hebrew remained Hebrew and the Aramaic, Aramaic. In the beginning of the second chapter the editor condensed the beginning of the tract that forms that chapter, and made his condensation in Hebrew.

The reason of the use of the two languages seems to have been political rather than anything more recondite. The vision of the four monarchies set no term to the fall of the Babylonian monarchy under which these prophecies were published, so they were written in Aramaic. Belshazzar's feast was not committed to writing till the reign of Darius the Mede. So it could be published in Aramaic also. But when the vision told of the fall of the Persian Empire before the Greek power, with which Cyrus had come in contact already, that was concealed in Hebrew to escape the eyes of the Babylonian public, under the authority of Cyrus. We submit this with some diffidence, yet it seems to us a simple solution. Of course, we may regard the first chapter as added some time after the death of Daniel, in the reign of Darius Hystaspis or Xerxes.

THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

A NOTE ON BISHOP COPLESTON'S "BUDDHISM, PRIMITIVE AND PRESENT, IN MAGADHA AND IN CEYLON."¹

BY PROF. MAX MÜLLER.

Buddhism, Primitive and Present, is a startling title. Much as Buddhism has been studied of late, there are few scholars, if any, who at present would undertake to write a history of Buddhism from its first beginning to the present day. Bishop Copleston himself has evidently felt the magnitude of his undertaking, and has wisely limited his *Buddhism, primitive and present*, to Magadha and Ceylon. Even that is an enormous task, yet Bishop Copleston might well have felt that there were few scholars better prepared than himself for undertaking so serious and difficult a work. His book certainly contains a great deal of valuable information, and will be welcomed by all students of Buddhism. It may claim a place in that small class of books which describe Buddhism from its own authentic documents. Dr. Neumann in his *Buddhistische Anthologie* has lately divided the large number of publications on Buddhism into five classes: 1. Those which are founded on the ancient and genuine Buddhist canon, the Tripitaka, such as

¹ Published by Messrs. Longman & Co.

Oldenberg's *Buddha*; 2. Those which depend on ancient and modern Pāli texts, mostly known before and not always trustworthy, such as the excellent works of Spence Hardy, Köppen, Rhys Davids, Sangermano, Bigandet, Alabaster, &c.; 3. Those which have taken their information from the northern degenerate Buddhism, whether from Nepalese, Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian, or Japanese sources, such as the works of Burnouf, Schmidt, Csoma Körösi, Féer, Beal, Bunyiu Nanjio, Wassiljew, &c.; 4. Those which give a general historical survey of Buddhism, often from very insufficient materials; 5. Those which contain either enthusiastic panegyrics of Buddhism, such as Olcott's *Buddhist Catechism*, or depreciatory criticisms and unfair comparisons of Buddhism with Christianity—their number is very large!

Bishop Copleston has no doubt availed himself of the works of his predecessors, and of the numerous translations of portions of the *Tripitaka* which are now accessible in the *Sacred Books of the East*. But he has used them critically, and he has likewise studied original Pāli texts which had not been utilized before, and thus made valuable additions to the common stock of Buddhist lore.

But by limiting his work to Buddhism in Magadha and Ceylon, we regret that he has been induced to leave out one of the most important, though no doubt at the same time one of the darkest, phases in the history of Buddha's religion, namely, its division into two schools, or, more correctly, into two religions, commonly, though inaccurately, called Northern and Southern Buddhism. The Bishop can hardly plead that Northern Buddhism has nothing whatever to do with Magadha and Ceylon. If Hiouen-tsang, the great Chinese traveller, be right, the Buddhists of Ceylon in his time, *i.e.* in the seventh century, belonged principally to the Mahāyāna school. But even if his account were wrong or exaggerated, the schism itself is one of the most critical and interesting events in the whole history of Buddhism, and to leave it out of consideration in a history of Buddhism, primitive and present, is worse than leaving out the Reformation in a history of the Christian Church, primitive and present. This schism concerns the South as well as the North. Besides, it is at present the great crux of all historical students of the Buddhist religion, and we had a right to expect that the Bishop would have given us the results at which he himself has arrived with regard to this unsolved historical problem.

Whoever has studied Buddhism knows that what is commonly called Buddhism is not one, but at least two religions, which differ from each other, not simply as Protestantism differs from Roman Catholicism, for here we have to deal with the restoration of the primitive form of Christianity, which existed before Roman Catholicism, but quite as much as Mohammedanism differs from Judaism. That there is some historical connection between the two cannot be doubted. It is clear also that the one is older and more primitive than the other. I proposed some time ago to distinguish the two by calling the older religion *Buddhism*, the more recent *Bodhism*.

In the former, Buddha Sâkyamuni himself is the most prominent personality, in the latter the Prince of Kapilavastu is but one out of many teachers, and the absorbing subject is the obtainment of Bodhi, knowledge or enlightenment, through which man may become a Bodhisattva, a Buddha designate, and finally a real Buddha. Bodhi, knowledge, or enlightenment, is the result; buddhi, understanding, the instrument, while Buddha means the Enlightened. This Bodhism calls itself Mahâyâna, lit. the Great Go, and seems to have conferred on the other the name of Hinayâna, or Little Go. Burnouf translated these names by *le grand Véhicule*, or *le petit Véhicule*, others explain them by the large and the small boat for crossing the ocean of the world. It has generally been supposed that what Burnouf called Northern Buddhism is the same as the Mahâyâna, and what he called Southern Buddhism the same as the Hinayâna, and that the sacred texts of the former are composed in a more or less corrupt Sanskrit, those of the latter in Pâli. Bishop Copleston seems to incline to this opinion, but he has not thought it necessary to produce his reasons. We should remember that the distinction between Northern and Southern Buddhism is unknown in India. It was made by European scholars. By Northern Buddhism they meant that of Nepaul, Thibet, China, Mongolia, and Japan; by Southern Buddhism that of Ceylon (since third cent. B.C.), of Burma (since fifth cent. A.D.), and of Siam (since seventh cent. A.D.). But it has never been proved that this distinction corresponds to the distinction between the Mahâyâna and Hinayâna schools. Neither locality nor language can serve as a real distinction between these two schools. Yet there are some most striking features by which to distinguish one from the other. Thus, to mention a few only, in the Hinayâna school the question whether Buddha, after his death, continues to exist anywhere is declined, and answered neither in the affirmative nor in the negative. In the Mahâyâna school the Buddhas are distinctly immortal, and their believers expect to join them after death, in their various paradises. Again, it is one of the most characteristic features of the Hinayâna school that *Karma*, i.e., work done here on earth (*oramtakā*), goes on working for ever whether for good or for evil, and that every future existence is determined by a man's deeds in this life, just as his present condition in this life was determined by his acts in a former life. In one of the Mahâyâna-sûtras, the Sukhâvatî-vyûha, which I published in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, we are told on the contrary that beings are not born again in the paradise of Buddha, as a reward and result of good works performed by them in their present life (*avaramâtraka*), but that if a man will only at the approach of death repeat the name of the Buddha Amitâbha for ever so many times, then that Buddha, surrounded by innumerable Srâvakas (disciples) and Bodhisattvas (future Buddhas), will appear to him, he will depart this life with a tranquil mind, and be born in Sukhâvatî, the blessed paradise of Buddha Amitâbha. This is no doubt a much easier process, and might be called the large vehicle, as being the vehicle most popular with the majority of mankind. We know from

travellers how this system is practised at the present moment in Chinese monasteries, where the monks, worse than praying-wheels, go on repeating the name of Buddha day and night, till they reduce themselves to a state of utter idiocy. But we know also how beautiful this dying prayer may become in the mouth of Mahāyāna Buddhists, how they would decline to reap any reward for the good deeds performed by them in this life, and simply trust to the mercy of Buddha. This is shown by the death-bed scene of Hiouen-thsang, the famous Chinese pilgrim, who visited India in the seventh century, and died in China with the following prayer on his lips: "I desire to see the merits of my good deeds returned on all mankind. I desire to be born in the heaven called Tushita, to be admitted among the disciples of Maitrēya (the coming) Buddha, and to serve him as my teacher and affectionate Lord. I desire to be born in future births here on earth, that I may accomplish with unceasing zeal my duties to humanity, and at length arrive at the condition of supreme wisdom (Abhisambodhi) and attain Nirvāna."

It is easy to see that locality, whether North or South, has but little to do with the distinction between Mahāyāna and Hinayāna. The Buddhists themselves ascribe the foundation of the Mahāyāna-Buddhism to Nāgārguṇa and to the Fourth Council, held in Kashmīr in the first century A.D., while the Hinayāna school dates from the death of Buddha, or at least from the Council of Vaisālī, held 100 years after Buddha's death. During the two centuries after Buddha's death eighteen sects of the Hinayāna school are said to have arisen, and by the time of Asoka, in the third century, six more had been added. The Mahāyāna was originally but one sect, when it arose after the Council in Kashmīr. But it was by no means confined to the North of India as little as the Hinayāna sects were to the South. No doubt Ceylon was originally converted by Hinayānists, even before they had that name, but in the time of Hiouen-thsang (678 A.D.), many of the 20,000 friars of Ceylon had turned Mahāyānists. This may be doubtful, but even Fahjan, in the fifth century, knows already of Mahāyānists as far South as Orissa. On the other hand, one of the Hinayāna sects is called Uttarāpathaka and Uttariya, another Haimavata, names that clearly point to the North of India.

As to language again, the Hinayāna canon was, no doubt, composed in Pāli, while the language employed at the Mahāyāna Council, under Kanishka, is said to have been Sanskrit. But the Mahāvastu, for instance, which is ascribed to the Lokottaravādins, a subdivision of the Mahāsāṅghikas, and therefore a sect of the Hinayāna, which Hiouen-thsang knew as settled as far North as Kashmīr and Bamiyan, is written not in Pāli, but in vulgar Sanskrit. So is the Divyāvadāna, which, according to Prof. Rhys Davids (*J. R. As. Soc.* 1891, p. 413), is to be reckoned as a Hinayāna work. The Lalitavistara, the legendary life of Buddha, on the contrary, which calls itself a Mahāyāna work, and is written in vulgar Sanskrit, is ascribed by some Chinese authorities to the school of the Sabbatthi-vādins, a Hinayāna school, and under a slightly differing title to the Kāsyapiyas, which may be the old Hinayāna school of the Kassapikas, or possibly a Kashmīrian Mahāyāna

school. We also know from Hiouen-thsang that at his time there existed schools which studied both the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna.

It is clear from all this that the origin of the Mahāyāna school and its relation to the Hinayāna in later times forms a subject of supreme importance in the history of Buddhism. Bishop Copleston has certainly shown a proper discretion in not mixing up, like other writers, these two totally different religions. There was a time when the Jaina religion was looked upon as a mere variety of Buddhism, whereas now it is treated as an independent form of faith and worship. Yet the Mahāyāna is more remote from the Hinayāna than the Jaina religion is from either. We are truly grateful to Bishop Copleston for what he has done, but we should have felt more grateful still if he had rendered his excellent account of Buddhism, past and present, more complete by a chapter on the branching off of the Mahāyāna school or Bodhisim in the first century of our era.

CURRENT AMERICAN THOUGHT.

THE ELOCUTION OF THE PULPIT. By Rev. JOSEPH V. O'CONNOR (*The Catholic World*).—Hearers have become so accustomed to the solemn cadences of the "preaching voice," that they are startled at hearing a preacher talking from the pulpit in an easy, conversational tone. Under a misapprehension of the true aim of preaching, and of the dignity of the pulpit, good and effective preachers have been deluded into adopting a style of elocution the farthest removed from the natural. Mr. O'Connor writes to warn against the pretentious professors of elocution who catch the "unfortunate clergyman, and drill him in hollow, dismal tones, varied now and then with a spurt of 'explosive orotund' which, the good man is assured, will thrill the most apathetic congregation." After detailing an amusing personal experience with one of these elocutionist professors, the writer deals with the simple rules which have been verified in the experience of all successful preachers, and commend themselves to our common sense.

The first requisite of all public speaking is that the words should be easily understood by the audience. The intelligibility of the speaker is the *primum oratoricum*. All the graces of oratory are valueless unless first of all the words reach the hearers plainly and distinctly. This rests on two simple laws, the law of articulation, and the law of measured speech. In articulation pay attention to the consonants only. The vowels take care of themselves. False elocution dwells upon the vowel, and results in what Shakespeare calls "mouthing." That false and disagreeable tone which is proverbially associated with the pulpit comes from drawing the vowel and neglecting the consonant. Strike the consonant clearly and sharply.

It seems strange to say that you cannot be *too* slow. There is always the danger of speaking at a rate of speed incompatible with perfect intelligibility. The master of the art restrains his ardour in the very tempest and whirlwind of passion. Speak for awhile as though you saw a comma after every word; and even then the probabilities are that you speak too fast. It takes time for sound to travel, and what

seems to you a dragging of words is just the very condition which your distant hearer needs in order to understand you perfectly.

Dare to be yourself. A man's speech is part of his character and personality. Your manner of utterance is the result of your mental and bodily organization. Correct any faults resultant from carelessness in delivery, and be yourself at your best. We cannot all be orators, but we all may become good speakers. No time is better employed than in practising aloud the proper pronunciation of words.

The law of emphasis is simplicity itself. We never make a false emphasis in our daily talk, because we never emphasize what is obvious, well-known, and self-evident. It is only in the pulpit we declare with tremendous force that the wind *blows* and the rain *falls*, and that the servants should place a ring on the prodigal's *hands* and shoes on his *feet*.

The close of the sentence is the hardest to manage from a tendency to drop the voice a tone too low. Few can keep the voice up at the end of a sentence (which is often the key-word) by stressing a little the words that immediately precede the last. Gesture cannot be taught. The most you can do is to have a judicious friend point out any awkwardnesses, and have the good sense to follow his advice.

The style and manner of speaking most agreeable to the American is the simple, direct, and conversational. The great political leaders instinctively adopt this style in addressing mass meetings.

THE PLACE OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE IN MODERN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION. By Prof. JOHN PHELPS TAYLOR (*Andover Review*)—Never were the twin lights of science and democracy shining more brightly on the path of the Biblical scholar. This is the hour when press and pulpit vie with one another in discussing Biblical inspiration and authority. What the sixteenth century discovered the nineteenth century is rediscovering—the *English Bible*. And the English Bible should have the foremost place in modern theological education. This is not a truism, nor a presumption. Science is of priceless value to the minister. It promotes exact observation and love of truth, besides imparting a breadth of vision and richness of symbolism all its own. The languages, ancient and modern, are a preacher's second self. They are so many doors into the many-chambered palace of truth. The history of dogma and the traditions of the Church he cannot over-estimate; he will not under-estimate. By all means let the Christian student open his soul to Christian experience, Christian consciousness, Christian philosophy, Christian personality. But let him see to it that each and all of these faculties do obeisance in the present crisis to the English Bible, which in some sort illustrates and epitomizes them all, as it takes precedence of them all.

A first reason why the English Bible should hold the primary place in the instruction of the ministry is to be found in what the English Bible *is*, and is *seen to be to-day*. It is "no amulet from the skies. It is no urn of magical verses. It is no dialect of archangels. It is no Hebrew calculating machine. It is no shorthand report of the past. It is no iron clad programme of the future. It is no law-book of a nation in the clouds. It is no prayer book of the Jerusalem above. It is no idyl, or proverb, or narrative, or drama or biography, or correspondence, or apocalypse unruffled by human feeling and unstained by human crime. Rather is it a library and a literature palpitating with the presence of the living God, and vibrating with the accents of living men."

The sacred record has its stages of historic growth. The writers speak from their own individuality and environment, none the less, but all the more, that they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It is the most human of books. "Its every page is stamped with exile, poverty, shame, persecution, martyrdom, by its heroic

translators. Its sacred names are precious to human hearts and homes, to the stranger, the traveller, the widow, the fatherless, the captive, the soldier, the labourer, the bride, the little child, the great legislator, the poet, and the sage. The Psalter alone touches every key in the gamut of human sorrow and joy, fear and hope, wrath and love, prayer and praise." It is asked whether this volume of humanity is without human error? Calvin and Luther thought not. Modern scholarship agrees with them.

A second reason for the pre-eminence of the English Bible is found in its relation to other theological disciplines. The English Bible is at once the fountain-head and the masterpiece of sacred literature. Biblical history is a sham and a snare apart from the vernacular version. The sober, patient, accurate, truth-loving exegesis, which alone is worthy of the name, must either flow from or centre in the English Bible. What can we know of Christian ethics without drawing from the English Old Testament the ethics of Judaism, and from the English New Testament the ethical ideal of Christianity? Theology itself feels this ground-swell, and shows it in two ways. First, by a more critical use of the Scriptures in buttressing dogma. Second, and more notably, by passing from the systematic to the Biblical stage.

A third reason is found in the fact that the light of modern discovery in and around Palestine has largely emanated from it. Lovers of the English Bible are the supporters of the Palestine and Egypt Exploration Funds, and Prof. Taylor skilfully summarizes the remarkable discoveries which have both illuminated and reassured our confidence in the English Bible. But these are familiar to our readers.

A fourth reason may be given. Current *English literature* is contributing works of unique importance concerning it. Ten years ago Robertson Smith's *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1882) and Prof. George T. Ladd's *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture* (1883) were creating much alarm, because those works embodied the results of German Biblical criticism. Very different is the feeling now entertained. The epoch-making book of this year (1892) is Cheyne's *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*. By its side must stand a work in which every modest, candid, independent, reverent student of the Old Testament will detect a spirit kindred to his own—Canon Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. His "lists of Hebrew words and phrases are a monument of indefatigable scholarship. His independent views on the Babylonian authorship of Isaiah ii., on the inferiority or superiority of the LXX. text of Jeremiah to the Masoretic, on the probable Maccabean date of the book of Daniel in connection with the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, on the idealized history of the Chronicles, with traditionary foundations, are models of lucid and compact statement. To the lovers of Ruth he brings the welcome opinion that the delicious pastoral breathes the air before the Exile. To the admirers of Job he adduces attractive grounds for locating the masterpiece of Hebrew religious philosophy in the era when the Jews hung their harps on the willows of Babylon."

A decade ago there was virtually nothing in English on the Canon of the Old Testament that was up to date. Now we have Ryle's "Canon of the Old Testament," a work commendable for its style, learning, and spirit. He places the virtual completion of the threefold Old Testament book a century before the Advent. It must have been before the antagonism of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and the rise of the great Rabbinic schools. The Pentateuchal analysis has received its best exposition in B. W. Bacon's *Genesis of Genesis*, of which Dr. Mendenhall says, in the *Methodist Review*, "The work is as able in plan as it is masterly in execution." Prof. Taylor also notices, with qualified commendations, Dr. C. A. Briggs' work on *The Bible, the*

Church, and Reason, and Prof. Robertson's Baird Lecture for 1889 on *The Early Religion of Israel as set forth by Biblical Writers and by Modern Critical Historians*.

What are some of the methods by which the English Bible may secure and perpetuate its empire over the ministry and the Church of the future? 1. By resisting secondary influences tending to discredit the Bible. Materialism, Rationalism, Romanism, Socialism, Paganism, were never more united and more desperate in their efforts to shatter the word which is the sword of the Spirit. More insidious and threatening is the tone of unfairness in newspaper discussions, and the tendency to uncharitableness in denominational councils respecting the Bible itself! "When a journal, a divine, an organization, attempt to impose a *theory* of the English Bible for the English Bible itself, they lay thereby a yoke on the neck of the Pilgrim Church, which neither we nor our fathers are able to bear. To the cry of Biblical authority it is time to raise the counter-cry of Biblical liberty. The latter is the more Protestant watchword."

2. Make the most of the original languages of the Old and the New Testament. "To drink thus from the golden pipes of the Hebrew and the Greek at the fountains of the English Bible would go far to restore it to its proud pre-eminence with ministers and congregations. 8. Another step in the same direction would be the preaching of the *morality* of the New Testament. It is too late to say that this morality is too ethereal for the modern world. Even as sentimentalized by a Tolstoi, the Sermon on the Mount has moved contemporary Europe. Character is the preacher's aim, and these ethics revolve around character. Expressing principles, they express them in detail. They seek to regenerate society through its individual members, and in the practical details of conduct. "The Old Testament prophet is a tract for the times. Amos handles the social question of the hour with a depth of sympathy for the poor, and a moral indignation against the rich, which Savonarola only echoed. But the preaching of the Carpenter of Nazareth has a poise in the midst of its penetration which the demagogue cannot understand. 'The moral positiveness of Jesus' ethical teaching has the sunny certainty, the quiet and reasoned confidence of physical science.' It is present, personal, human, superhuman. It sets its ministers as immovably against the despotism of amalgamated iron as the despotism of amalgamated gold."

(4) By emphasizing the witness of the fourth Gospel to the Divinity of our Lord. Of course the humanity of our Lord is also delineated there. But never is the Master's intellect scholastically unreal, or the Master's teaching theologically fallible, or the Master's character ethically wrong. His manhood is like, yet unlike, ours. But the organ-note of the fourth Gospel is the Deity of Jesus. The pre-existent Christ, the eternal Son of God, the Logos who was in the beginning with God, and who was God, is its sublime and triumphant picture of the Master. Concerning the fourth Gospel, Bishop Lightfoot said, "I feel from my heart that the truth which this Gospel more especially enshrines—that Jesus Christ is the very Word incarnate—is the one lesson which, duly apprehended, will do more than all our public efforts to purify and elevate life here by imparting to it hope and strength, and the one study which alone can fully prepare us for a joyful immortality hereafter." There is no theology to be compared with the theology of John. He who sees and scatters this light is bearing witness in his own world-tongue to the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

WHEN IS THE POPE INFALLIBLE? By Rev. E. M. BRANDI, S.J. (*The North American Review*).—This article is valuable as corrective of prevailing impressions, and giving precision of knowledge on a subject of some complexity. It is written

from a sympathetic point of view, and does not discuss the question whether the Pope has just grounds for claiming any sort of infallibility. The inquiry is concerned only with the limitations under which the so-called infallibility is placed.

In 1870 the Pope's infallibility was solemnly defined by the Vatican Council. It is a supernatural *assistance* of the Holy Ghost, whereby the Pope, as head of the whole Church, is preserved free from error whenever he defines a doctrine that belongs to faith or morals. In Catholic theology, an infallible Pope does not mean one gifted with inspiration, or commissioned to reveal to the Catholic world new dogmas. The gift of inspiration is chiefly positive, whilst the gift of infallibility is negative; infallibility is *only* an assistance securing the Pope from the possibility of declaring error to be truth and truth error. All Catholic theologians agree in denying the existence of any new Catholic revelation after the times of the Apostles. The special assistance of the Holy Ghost is given to the Pope for the *only* purpose of preserving, explaining, and defending the revelation already made to and through the Apostles.

An infallible Pope does not mean one who is sinless, or cannot sin. Impeccability and infallibility must not be confused. Impeccability is a gift of the will; infallibility is a gift of the understanding. Impeccability implies a permanent gift that makes the receiver agreeable to God, and it is given chiefly for the good of the person who receives it. On the other hand, infallibility is a transitory gift, gratuitously given for the good of the universal Church, and only then when the Pope, as its supreme doctor, is teaching the Church. This point needs to be clearly apprehended. The Pope is not infallible in his private conversations or teachings. It belongs to him *only* in his official capacity, as the supreme teacher of the Church; and *only* when, in virtue of his Apostolic power, he defines a doctrine that belongs to faith or morals.

A doctrine may belong to faith in two different ways: (1) *Directly*, if it be a revealed truth; (2) *Indirectly*, if it be in contact with revelation, and necessary for the custody, exposition, development, and defence of what has been revealed. These may include some *facts* which, because of their intimate connection with a dogmatic truth, are called "dogmatic facts." Catholic theologians agree that such facts are within the sphere of the Pope's infallible teachings. But this must not be misunderstood. Every truth belonging to faith or morals may be infallibly defined by the Pope; but from this it does not follow that every truth infallibly defined by the Pope is a dogma of the Catholic faith, and therefore to be believed with a Divine and Catholic faith. "To be a dogma of Catholic faith, a doctrine must be a *truth revealed* by God, which the Pope defines to be such. If the doctrine or fact defined be *not* a revealed truth, then, although it too must be unhesitatingly believed, it is so believed *only* with an *ecclesiastical* faith, that is to say, with a faith that has for its motive 'the authority of God's Church defining,' not of God Himself directly revealing."

The Pope speaks infallibly (*ex cathedra*) when the four conditions laid down by the Vatican Council are met. They are: (1) The Pope must speak *as Pope*, as Head of the Church; (2) The Pope must speak for the whole Church, no matter whom he directly addresses; (3) The Pope must *define* the doctrine—he must pass a final judgment, giving sufficient indication of his intention to oblige the interior assent of Catholics; (4) The doctrine thus defined by the Pope must be one which is contained within the sphere of the subject-matter of infallibility.

These explanations and limitations are applied by the author to the utterances of the last two Popes, Pius IX. and Leo XIII.; but into these illustrations it is not needful that we should enter, as we have no wish to even seem to uphold such a

dogma as that of the "Immaculate Conception." It need only be said that, from the Catholic point of view, the four necessary conditions were fulfilled in this case.

The position taken by the writer, which guides and tones the article, is indicated in his closing paragraph. "The Apostle Peter, to whom Christ, the Divine Founder of the Church, 'gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. xvi.), and whom He appointed to be His vicar, 'to feed His lambs and His sheep' (John xxi.), still lives in his successors, the sovereign Pontiffs, the Bishops of Rome. To each and every one of them, as represented in the person of St. Peter, Christ has said, 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not,' and 'Do thou confirm thy brethren' (Luke xxii.). Hence Peter's voice has never been silent. As it spoke of old by the mouth of Linus and of Clement, of Leo and Gregory the Great, so, in these our days, has it spoken to the Catholic Church, against which 'the gates of hell shall never prevail,' by the mouths of Pius IX. and of the reigning Pontiff, Leo XIII."

THE NEW NATURAL THEOLOGY. By Rev. JOHN W. BUCKHAM (*The Andover Review*).—In no branch of theological science is reconstruction more necessary and urgent than in that of Natural Theology. What does nature really teach concerning God, if, indeed, she has any definite and coherent revelation of Him to make to man? It seems quite impossible that science can have robbed nature of her theology when we consider what power of revealing God nature has possessed for men in all the ages. In the Book of Job the revelation of God in nature furnishes a sufficient answer to the darkest problem of human perplexity, and calms the malady of a soul in utmost distress. After the most intense mental suffering, torn by throes of doubt, Job accepts the testimony of nature as both a vindication of God's providence and a revelation of His person. If natural theology is sufficient for such a result, it may be assumed that the instinct which turns to nature for a revelation of God is a true one. Take the distinctive truths concerning God which nature manifests to us, and see if they are annulled by the discoveries of science.

1. The Transcendence of God. The incomprehensibility of nature is one of her chief disclosures of God. It might seem that, with all that modern science has found out, the realm of the inscrutable had been taken captive. Not so. Is it not one of the great confessions of science that she cannot discover the origin of life? The borderland of mystery will never be crossed, however far it is forced back upon the confines of the infinite. There is a place where one must pause at length before the unknowable, blinded by the intensity of the light. The tendency of scientific research "to kill out wonder" is only a transient and accidental phase of the scientific spirit. Irreverence is not a necessary characteristic even of those who are most ardent in the study of natural phenomena. A larger and less hasty induction will reveal to us that science has only discovered the transcendence of God the more clearly by confronting us more sharply with the territory where God works in His inscrutable absoluteness of power and wisdom. Nature is always testifying that God is *above* her. Infinite Wisdom alone can account for the mysteries of nature, Infinite Power for her forces.

2. The Immanence of God. Formerly the *mathematics* of nature provided the evidence of God. Now *life* has become the absorbing study of science. Generalizations, classifications, and nomenclatures have given place to investigations into the operation of forces, and the movement and development of sentient life. Theology has, unfortunately, lent her strength to the combating of the new facts. It has been forgotten to ask if God may not be as truly revealed in the processes of life as in the painting of a feather or the structure of a crystal. Action is more wonderful than adaptation. Life is more admirable than form. Paley's watch, like nature, is

nothing in its power to reveal God in comparison with this wondrous thing we call *life*, which God is everywhere displaying and perfecting. This truth of the Divine immanence pantheism has discerned in nature, and, discerning, been overmastered by it, to the losing of the consciousness of its great corollary, the transcendence. But it has done good service in witnessing to the "feeling of a highest Being standing behind the phenomena as their true cause." Christianity must be, if it is the true and universal religion, so far a natural religion as to recognize fully the fact of the Divine immanence both in nature and in the human heart.

3. God as a God of Love. It is often inferred that nature makes nothing known regarding the moral character of God. But beneficence is surely a sign of love. Food, and sleep, and warmth, and healing—these are the universal largesses of nature which reveal the love of God. Disease and suffering are not natural, but unnatural, issuing from some infringement of natural laws. Even the great law of strife in the animal world may be beneficent and productive of the largest good. Unless a sense of the love of God towards His creation results from the observation of nature, meaning by nature "the integrity of impression made by manifold natural objects," it argues, I think, some defect of vision in the observer, physical or spiritual. Nature is not only beneficent, but beautiful, and beauty is the reflection of love. If there is beauty, there seems to be also ugliness; if there is grace, so also there seems to be deformity. But Kingsley was probably right when he said, "I have never been able to get rid of the belief that the ugliest beast . . . and the most devilish has been created because it is beautiful and useful to some being or other." The ugliness and repulsiveness of animals comes to us from our seeing them perform actions which in ourselves would spring from malignant and selfish motives. The greater part, if not all, of that behaviour in animals, which we instinctively refer to the Satanic impulses, is only the reflection of ourselves seen in them.

The natural evidences of God in His transcendence, His immanence, His love, have been represented as obtained by reflection and deduction. But in truth it is by intuition that they make themselves most deeply felt. While very much is invisible and inaudible to us, we all discern far more spiritual truth in nature than we are conscious of, and the knowledge of God, which we thus unwittingly gain, is greater than we suppose.

Natural theology has also the seal of revelation. Christ sanctioned it, and incorporated it into His teaching. And natural theology has its eschatology. From contemplating nature as she is, we are led to inquire what she shall be. Modern science has discovered to us that nature is in process of steady advancement from imperfection to perfection, from the less perfect to the more perfect, from the simple in form to the manifold, from the less admirable to the more admirable. And this is in harmony with the teaching of Paul. As man has an eternal life and destiny, so likewise has nature. The elements may be consumed with fervent heat, or all animate life may perish in the chill atmosphere of a cooling planet, but the creative ideas which constitute the reality of all things must remain. The very meaning of nature is the *Becoming the about to be*. This has been her character from the very primordial germ. The promise of her eternal perfection will not fail.

CRITICISM AND THE COMMON LIFE. By Rev. A. A. BERLE, Brighton, Mass. (*The Bibliotheca Sacra*).—Three causes have brought about the remarkable changes in the religious opinions of our generation. The revival of critical science in all its forms, the rapid succession of objective and experimental examples of the method, and the changes within the domain of Biblical criticism itself. The doctrine of evolution is

now almost universally accepted, and is even influencing theology. A great literature has arisen, having for its problem the reconciliation of traditional views with the new doctrine, or the annihilation of the old views, and the presentation of the supplanting new ones. These books and articles urge the need of bringing the religious thinking of the time into line with the new movements that are demonstrating their presence so effectively in other sciences. No age but has fancied itself one of general and unprecedented scepticism. At no period has the Church lacked a sufficient number of zealous advocates who predicted her utter ruin unless certain changes were instantaneously incorporated into her creeds. The verdict of history is that the cause of true religion has never been endangered by any one particular view, and that the calm judgment of the Christian Church, arising from her appeal to experience and practical worth, has been nearly, if not quite, correct as to the real force of the ideas brought to her notice.

It is a fact that the Church is now making the most widespread and exhaustive re-examination of the fundamental truths of Christianity which she has ever made. The popular conception of the truths of Christianity is permeated by a spirit which cannot be called other than scientific. Christianity is being examined with a view to determining what its form should be, and what its popular presentation should include. But it must not be supposed that Christianity itself is on trial. The question before us is, What is Christianity, and how shall we at the earliest possible moment secure its world-wide adoption? Such an inquiry must begin with the Scriptures. Upon the ground of Christian experience no final statutes can be enacted. Upon the phases of the spiritual activity which from time to time make their appearance no argument can be builded. Against the various benevolent enterprises no word of criticism, except as to method and results, can be raised. Hence, if the Church deals with the adequacy or inadequacy of a doctrine, she has been forced to attack its Biblical basis or authority. No attack is thus made upon the Bible itself, only upon the Biblical basis of some particular statement of doctrine. Any attack upon the Bible is a renunciation of Christian faith. But the acceptance of the Divine authority of the Bible does not, cannot, and never did involve the acceptance of any given view of the character, authorship, or purpose of any book in the Bible, and cannot be affected by any such view except as such a view distinctly and unmistakably has for its conclusion the rejection of the Bible as the Divine standard of faith.

Just in proportion as this or that doctrine has played an important part in the common religious life will the critical gaze be fastened upon it, and its right to continue as a part of the common life be questioned. The healthfulness of this process cannot fail to be evident to any intelligent observer. It enables the Church to keep her vital doctrines from being encrusted with error, or being superseded by simply fleeting impressions which for the time obtain an unworthy pre-eminence. That the critical study of the Bible is no novel thing is shown in the striking fact that it is itself the product of a sifting process. From the many early books some have been selected, and have become canonical. The discrimination could only have been based on the correspondence of the facts in the writings with the experience of the Church. Those which were accepted as of Divine authority were so accepted solely because they met the spiritual need, and corresponded to the spiritual type of the Churches accepting them. This could be the only test, and certainly the only rational test. But in some of the books thus accepted were doctrines and ideas diametrically opposed to doctrines and ideas found in others. There is evidently no fixed type of Christian experience, and it was found necessary to admit both; the New Testament thus becoming a Mosaic with certain fundamental elements of

unity, but an innumerable array of minor and subordinate differences which crop out everywhere, and in the full understanding of which alone can the types of Christian experience be discovered and described.

Questions of various kinds are perpetually appearing and requiring the judgment of the Church as to their bearing upon the faith of Christendom. And it must be borne in mind that no idea or doctrine claimed to be in the Scriptures and a part of them can be pronounced against the historic faith unless with such classification goes a decree of rejection of Christianity itself, as represented in the Bible, its objective standard.

The historic method of criticism is the practical application of the theory of natural development, applied to the literature of religion. Objectively speaking, the faith of Christendom is its Bible. It may be argued that there was faith before the existence of the Bible; but the Bible alone gives us the record concerning it. The Church and the future of Christianity are inseparably bound up with the fate of the Bible. And this means the canon of Scripture, as the experience of centuries has defined it. There it must look for the record of the types of Christian living, and there it must expect the revision of its religious ideas. The Bible has become the final authority within the Church for the standards of her own life and practice.

The work of the critic has nothing to do with the Bible itself, considered with reference to its Divine authority and power. His work seems to have to do merely with the arrangement of the material in its best form so that the Christian judgment may most easily know just what its Bible contains. As to what the Bible is, or how much she shall accept or reject, the Church does not ask her critics at all; she settles these questions in the court of experience. All that her critic as such can do is to work over the material with a view to presenting it in the best light. "The Church of to-day, while she is interested in whatever discoveries are made bearing upon the authenticity and credibility of the various books of the Bible, cannot, and does not, raise these questions because she has the slightest doubt on these points. As regards the faith of the Church, the question whether Moses ever saw the written documents now comprising our Hexateuch amounts to nothing. The same is true about the Psalms, or the second Isaiah. It is true of almost every one of the leading critical questions under discussion. All these documents are in the Bible; they are the product of the Church; the Church cannot deny herself."

Has the uncritical majority in the Church anything to do with the state of critical opinion? To this large class the critics have almost always stood in an attitude more or less of opposition. The reason may be that, unable to comprehend the exact bearing of the statements made by the critics, and conscious that the spirit of evangelical piety was not usually the ruling spirit, they have assumed hostility. The critics, on the other hand, have usually had little but contempt for the multitude, and have not hesitated to express it with more or less freedom.

What are the legitimate elements of the criticism from which the Church may be expected to derive profit and inspiration, together with material for the furtherance of her task of saving the world? It is possible to classify the elements which should enter into critical judgment under groups which may be more or less intelligible.

- (1) The historical element. The philosophy of history must be recognized as equally true with the remaining philosophies. It must be applied to religious history.
- (2) The psychological element. The Old Testament presents the finest collection of illustrations for psychological investigation found anywhere in literature. The study of the varieties of imagination found there will reveal wonders to those not initiated.

All literature is, in a sense, the expression of an inner impulse which seeks literature as the medium of communicating with the world. It is this inner impulse of the Scripture writers which is the most necessary, and the most elusive of all the elements of sound critical judgment. (3) And rational criticism has a necessary practical element. There is a notion that the scholar has little or nothing to do with the practical outcome of his studies; but the real leaders of progress in thought, as well as in practical benevolence, have almost universally been the preachers of the Church rather than her profound thinkers. Criticism must have the practical touch which makes the critic co-worker with the expositor, and the fellow-labourer with his brethren in the Church.

The common experience which belongs equally to all rational minds is the link which ought to bind criticism and the common life together. After all the various sources of human knowledge have been searched through, whether satisfactorily or not, the retreat is upon the personal life and the inward witness. This personal element is one factor always common to criticism and the common life. The recognition of the value of the personal life with its infinite capacity, and yet its singular dependence, constitutes the most unique of all the forces which move the mind of man. The unity of all life in a common dependence, and looking to a common redemption should be the ruling element in criticism, as it is already the dominant thought in the common life. Pietism without critical insight must produce intellectual degradation, but criticism without piety means sterility of thought and lifelessness. The common life is the great storehouse of the facts that most nearly relate to life and its culture and nurture.

WHAT WAS MAN BEFORE HE WAS? By the late RICHARD ABBEY, D.D. Yazoo City, Miss. (*Christian Thought*).—This article deals with the origin and antiquity of the corporeal being man, in view of modern suggestions in the line of evolution. Science and revelation are our sources of information, but they do not testify on the same points. The Bible states as a mere unexplained fact that God formed or created man, but is rigidly silent as to any mode of doing it. Science testifies solely as to the manner in which man came, whatever may have been the prime agency in producing him. So there is no necessary conflict.

Everything has its antecedence. To trace it, if it can be done, or as far as it may be done, is the business of science. Absolute origination is to us wholly unthinkable. Some scientists trace human antecedence upward through distant animal races or species. As a purely scientific question the theologian is not concerned with it, because it does not deny the Biblical statement of Divine creation, but deals only with the method adopted by the Divine wisdom. In the line of heredity man is said to have descended from the monkey. If so it must have been in one of two ways: 1. Somewhere in remote antiquity, some one full-blood female monkey gave birth to a full-blood man child, and, about the same time, this monkey or another gave birth to a full-blood female child, and thus the human race began. But no scientist will admit this mode of human origin, because it is unnatural; there is no precedent for such radical and sudden change. 2. Away somewhere in high antiquity, some one monkey family or tribe, or possibly more than one, began, by most likely imperceptibly slow degrees, to separate, disunite, or switch off from the main stock. It was a secession or withdrawal from monkeyhood proper, becoming, generation after generation, less and less brutelike, and more and more manlike, until, in sufficient time, the offshoot became as we see him now, a separate race, and we call him human. But before we can receive this theory we want explanation on the following points:—(1) Was it ever known in any other department of nature

that an entirely new race of animals was produced in this way? (2) What could have set on foot this man-making enterprise in the first place? (3) Another seemingly inexplicable thing to be accounted for in this world-transforming enterprise is, that in raising up this new and powerful ruler he should undergo such great degeneracy as is obvious. Men are two to four times as large as monkeys, and, size for size, have half their strength, and one-tenth their agility. Have we not lost a full half or more of the entire physical constitution of our animal ancestors? Man is the slowest, clumsiest, and most helpless animal on the earth. This well-known degradation and natural inferiority must have a cause, and it is the duty of science to show it. (4) The two and only great animal powers of mind by which life is sustained and reproduced are instinct and reason. The former belongs exclusively to brutes, and the latter exclusively to men. Man has no use for instinct. Brute has no use for reason. There was a time when *man*, though he came down through the monkey, did not exist, and so reason did not exist. It is important to be informed when, where, and how this new and wonderful power of reason got here. It was as new in the world then as would now be the introduction of a new race of animals with absolute vision, or any other utterly unknown endowment. By no possibility could reason be inherited from any living animal race then more than now. How did reason get into the world? Who wanted it? Why was it either sent or suffered? (5) Again, not only did this monkey family in the course of its procedure in acquiring humanity become the great patron and possessor of this new power which we call reason, but they lost their own great native power of instinct. How could that be? No monkey can do it now, even if he desired to do so.

Some object to the idea that man is the progeny of a seceding monkey tribe, and say that the theory called evolution does not confine itself to monkey ancestry. Formerly there may not have been an animal answering to the modern monkey, and so the monkey-succession argument fails. But monkey-origin need only be taken in the sense of animal ancestry of some kind, known or unknown. The theory and teaching is, that mankind is the product of some pre-existing forms of life that possessed the powers of instinct, and not reason. If that is not the hypothesis, then man was absolutely and independently primordial—essentially the same from a beginning. There can be no question about his origin unless there was an origination.

It is agreed on all hands that man is a new comer, and not of earth's original inhabitants. The world was well inhabited, and all conceivable demands of nature were supplied under a general system of animal instinct. Then it seemed that an entirely new kind of inhabitant of earth would be useful. But how useful? No general betterment of the world could be conceived of. But we are told that at length, "Some ancient member of some anthropomorphous sub-group gave birth to man." So the great monkey-kingdom divides into two races. The old, regular stock pursued its natural course, and occupies its proper place in the forest to-day. The seceding branch pursued a most unnatural course, it changed into a new and utterly unknown race. It looks impossible that such parentage could produce such a progeny.

Supposing the difficulties to be all removed, and the monkey-origin of man to be an acknowledged theory, how does the case then stand as between the sceptical scientist and the polemical theologian? Who is gainer and who loser? The intelligent Christian may say to his sceptical friend, "If your theory is correct, you have done the Church good service; you have told us what we did not know before

viz., *How* God made man. The Bible teaches merely that God made him, or created him, with no intimation as to any mode of doing it." There is no theological ground of objection to monkey-origin, or any other mode of origin for man. Touching Divine actions of any kind, the Christian has no creed relating to any temporal or mundane surroundings, such as geography, time, horticulture, skill, manipulation, handicraft, or anything tangible or visible. As Scripture mentions no mode of human origination, how can we deny any particular alleged mode, however apparently false such mode may be? Many theologians, failing to discriminate carefully between the literal and the figurative language of early Genesis, lead sceptically-inclined men into the error of supposing that a visible mode of man-making is presented to the reader, when nothing is intended to be clearly taught but the fact of Divine agency.

The theologian has to do only with man as man, and not with something else that may have anteceded him. From the foregoing considerations it follows: 1. That the natural foregoing or antecedence of man, or of anything else, is legitimately in the keeping of natural science, and not of religion. 2. Therefore, when men, in the pursuit of physical science, began to speculate about something which may have had some agency in a future introduction of a rational or reasoning animal upon earth, the theologian in his proper vocation has no right to interfere. 3. All that scientists can pretend to do touching man's antecedency is to point out certain natural phenomena or processes leading to a then future manhood. 4. Therefore the question of fact whether God created man or not is not debateable. There are three popular theories of man's origin: 1. That he grew naturally, and without Divine direction, from certain primordial forms of life. 2. That he was divinely manufactured, on a certain day, at a certain locality, out of certain material. 3. That God created him.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By the EDITOR (*Andover Review*).—Those who lived the Christian life in the early times regarded it as something distinctive and new. They had come to it through various processes, and out of many schools of thought and religious belief. The "Epistle of Barnabas" describes Christians as "a new type of men." There was a re-invigoration of conscience, a higher standard of piety, a new ideal of virtue, and, together with this, a belief that perfect virtue can be attained. Virtue was not only an obligation, but an inspiration and an enthusiasm; no longer merely a surpassing ideal, but something that could be achieved. "Particular stress was laid upon adherence to the truth, upon purity, upon love to men, emphasized in manifold relations and particularized in many special services, upon patience and endurance, upon love to God and Christ, and gratitude for redemption and salvation, upon a confession of Christ in blameless lives and in deeds of compassion and kindness. Morality is taken up into religion; religion is carried into every relation and duty of life." There was a new and very definite and practical sense of a union of God with man in all his needs and capacities.

Who is recognized as the author and source of this new and Divine life? The definite newness of Christianity, its "singular pre-eminence," is found, not primarily and mainly in its religious truths and ethical precepts, many of which it inherited from Judaism and paganism, but "in the advent of the Saviour, even our Lord Jesus Christ, and His passion and resurrection," "in the Gospel in which the passion has been manifested to us and the resurrection fully accomplished," and which is "the completion of immortality," the full revelation of eternal life, and of the way in which it may be gained. Every religious duty and moral obligation discovered by human reason or enforced by previous Divine revelations gains through Christ a new

claim to observance. He is the pattern we are to copy, the sphere of conduct, the source and reality and object of life. The life of the early Church, as this is revealed in its literature, makes the same impression, as respects its relation to Christ, that is produced by its direct testimony. What in the one representation He is affirmed to be, in the other He is received as being, in a fellowship marked by sincerity, vitality, moral and spiritual fruitfulness.

There are other expressions of this same relationship to Christ. The Church comes forth from the days of the Apostles with usages and rites and sacraments which express its judgment and conviction of the true character of Him whose name it bore. It had a day of worship, which it called "the Lord's," in joyful memory of His resurrection, and in homage to Him who, in the natural creation, separated light from darkness, and in the new creation brought forth life from death. The day is a testimony to Christ's religious significance to the early Christians. Admission to the Church was by baptism. In the formula used the Son is associated with the Father and the Spirit. With the rite of baptism was connected, either implicitly or explicitly, from the beginning of the Church's history, a confession of faith in Jesus as the risen Saviour and Lord. The old Roman creed was a baptismal symbol, and was in use at Rome at least as early as the middle of the second century, and probably somewhat earlier. It presents, as the object of religious trust and hope, one God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ His only-begotten Son our Lord, and the Holy Spirit. Early Christian hymns speak of Christ as the Word of God, and affirm His Divinity. Doxologies appear early, and in these Jesus Christ is associated mediatorially with God. Early preaching was unconventional and missionary, mainly in the line of an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, whose main design was to glorify the nearest object of the Christian faith, the suffering and glorified Christ. The culmination of the Christian worship was at the Lord's Supper, and in its observance. "It is impossible to explain the extravagant and even materialistic theories of this sacrament, which afterwards became current, without the recognition of an intense faith, at the beginning of the history, in the presence of Christ with His disciples when they participated in it."

With these testimonies to the place Christ held in the life and worship of the Church should be combined that of martyrdom. The confession of the martyr was: "I am a Christian." It was a testimony to the name—a name which was invested by Him with Divine perfections.

Further evidence is found in the fact of the Christian Society. It was a unique creation. It had a spirit, a law, a method of its own, and lost its prerogative just in proportion as it parted with its distinctive excellence. Its spirit was the inspiration which came from Christ; its law was His perfection; its method, the imitation of His life—obedience, service, sacrifice like His own. What impresses us is the power, the virtue, that went out from Him.

It may be objected that the early Christian literature often represents Christ as distinct from God, and subordinate to Him. But if the Divine nature and life were really expressed through the Man Christ Jesus, they must appear under the forms and conditions of our humanity. Distinction and subordination are necessary aspects of the revelation which the faith of the early Church accepted as true and real. How it adjusted its belief in Christ to its strict monotheism the early epistolary literature gives us no suggestion.

From what source did the early Church derive its faith in Christ as God? It accepted the Jewish Scriptures as a Divine revelation, and used them freely in support of its beliefs. Yet it is plain that there was a motive to this searching of

these ancient writings which came from another source. The Church went to the Scriptures from Christ and because of Christ, as well as to Him because of the Scriptures and from them. It had also, some time before the middle of the second century, more or less generally in use the substance of our New Testament.

The faith of the early Church in Christ was a fellowship which included all the Apostles of Christ, and knew of no disagreement between them as to His person and history. And it bears no mark of being the product of a theological evolution, or, we should more exactly say, revolution, by which a Being first known to the Churches as only a man was afterwards deified by them. It is distinctly not a theology, but a life; it holds its truths, not as dogmas, but as motives; it rests in a Person, not in propositions; the truth of Christ's Divinity is used, not defended—presented by implication as the ground of trust, hope, courage, service, devotion to the highest ends, as something involved in being a Christian and in Christian experience. A strenuous endeavour is now making to explain the rise of the belief in Christ's Divinity by a reflective and theological process which sprung up after His death. His disciples, in order to idealize Him, invented or credulously reported stories respecting His miraculous birth. It were nearer the truth to say that out of the Church's life came its belief in Christ's Divinity. But neither is this the exact truth. It lived because He was Divine, and in its life His Divinity manifested itself.

This faith in the Divinity of Christ, held in the beginning, is attended with many difficulties to thought. It has faced these difficulties; it has made ever-repeated efforts, by this theory and by that, to remove or relieve them, and not wholly without success. Yet again and again the result has shown that the new theory would change the faith, that the faith could not be held in its integrity if thus explained. When such a result has become evident, the theories, one by one, have disappeared; not the faith. The life of the Church is from the life of Christ. It believes, and has always believed, that in Him is the eternal life, and that He can and does give this life to all who hunger and thirst for righteousness and for God. The Divinity of Christ as a doctrine lives, not only by Apostolic testimony, but in this perpetuated experience.

CHINESE AND MEDIEVAL GUILDS. By FRED. WELLS WILLIAMS (*The Yale Review*).—This is the continuation of an article which we summarized a few months since. Some of the information contained in this portion will be fresh and interesting to our readers. These Chinese guilds, in their relations with the police and the public welfare, must be regarded as both conservative and preservative forces of civilization. China is divided into a number of provinces, each governed by an officer. Within the provincial governor's jurisdiction troops are raised and sustained, justice administered, and the civil service maintained. These conditions exert a sensible influence upon the life and conduct of trading companies, who have long since learned the value of living on good terms with the authorities, and of resolving the laws, if possible, in harmony with their interests. The guild in China has never, so far as we know, become identified with the town government, but there are many instances in which it supplements the functions of the magistracy, and earns the favour of local rulers by unflinching obedience to their lawful decrees. Some guilds go so far as to uphold good ethics in trade, and to interdict fictitious buying and selling in their members. Immoral business methods are not uncommon in China, but the good effect upon a community of this insistence on commercial rectitude and good faith is incalculable.

The first impact of foreigners upon the empire was met by one of these corporate bodies, and trade across the water continued for more than a century to filter through the now famous Co-Hong guild at Canton. Their monopoly dated from the year

1720, and came to an end with the opening of the five ports to foreign commerce in 1842. It was a convenient means adopted by the Emperor for managing the foreign tea-trade without officially recognizing the unwelcome traders.

Guilds are common among Chinese who live in foreign countries, their institutions in the Pacific Islands and Straits Settlements being described as similar to those at home, the business being conducted in a similar way. Mr. Williams gives in full the ordinances of one of the guilds, but it is much too long and too elaborate to be transcribed here.

Less is known about the other class of guilds, the *Kung So*, or trades unions. They resemble more closely than the *Wei-kwan* their parallels in Europe and America, where they are quite as common, and exert their strength along much the same lines. Their development does not appear to be as perfect in China as in the West. Amongst mechanics the unions generally embrace masters and workmen as against society; journeymen or apprentices, except in a few of the largest centres, seldom uniting exclusively by themselves. To account for this would necessitate a careful examination of the whole social system of China; but there are deep-lying reasons for this phenomenon, among which may be suggested the ignorance and poverty of the menial class, the sharp distinctions in society from the lowest to the highest, the phlegmatic calm of the national temperament, &c. Strikes and combinations against employers are extremely rare, and always peaceably conducted; but in this regard we must remember that large factories and the huge plants they involve are unknown. Industrial life in Asia is practically where it was some two centuries ago in Europe. The unions are concerned principally with the regulation of work and wages, discountenancing cheating, resistance to unjust oppression from officials, arrangements as to apprentices, and mutual assistance to members. They do not always possess club-houses, their meetings being held in temples, tea-houses, or in any convenient public place. The same tendency towards making fines and penalties, to cover the expense of a feast or theatrical show, is seen among them as with their superiors, but fines are necessarily ineffectual in the case of a poor labourer who never has and never will have cash in his pocket. As might be expected, they are severe in respect to the employment of female labour, which is almost always prohibited in the arts and trades, though women are everywhere great field-hands and shopkeepers. Needle-makers allow exceptions in favour of the wives and daughters of their own craft, who are permitted to acquire the difficult art of drilling needle-eyes; but should either ever marry out of the union, employment would be withheld.

Clannishness is a Chinese characteristic, which renders sectionalism everywhere rampant. Many occupations form unions, membership in which is restricted to fellow townsmen. Fish-hook making at Wenchow is confined to men of that trade who belong to Fukien, and no Wenchowese is allowed to acquire the art. Needle-makers allow only Taichow and Kiangsu men to work in the city of Wenchow. Tallow-chandlers and tin-foil beaters are cited as the two most truculent classes, owing to their sectional jealousy. These men will not work with others of their craft who happen to belong to another prefecture, as it is, though labouring in different establishments, they are perpetually involved in feuds and fights. The practice of boycotting is perfectly understood in these as in the other associations, but it is usually applied without undue cruelty.

In China the guilds have for the most part preserved their primary function in sustaining civilization and elevating society. Under the incentive of the guild, every trader, every artisan, is made responsible in conduct and work to directors whom he trusts and cheerfully obeys, because he has himself appointed them; who are

therefore altogether different from those civil authorities whom he distrusts and tries to withstand. In a society which changes as slowly as that of China, or of mediæval Europe, where, in spite of occasional wars, the conditions of industrial life remain fairly stable, but where for various reasons the civil authority is unable or unwilling to maintain justice and equity between man and man, such an institution as the guild, once thoroughly established in the land, commends itself to the community as the sole reasonable resource against oppression on the one hand and anarchy on the other. Its drawback lies in the pretensions that spring from conscious power. In usurping, as it often must, the province of public authority, it incurs the risk to which every government within a government is liable. Apart, however, from its shortcomings, the guild performs the invaluable service of keeping alive a spirit of self-reliance and independence. It teaches the value of personal industry, integrity, mutual aid, and all the elementary virtues of social existence, and with its capacity—within limits—for change and expansion it provides fairly well the mediation needful for orderly and comfortable living.

Whatever may come to be the needs of the future, the Empire at present depends largely for its internal security upon these associations of its industrious inhabitants. They practically represent duty both to Church and State, and if they embody and typify the conservatism of Chinese character, they also sustain the elements in it that make for honesty and self-restraint, preserving it, as did their counterparts in Europe two or three centuries ago, for progress towards more liberal government and a regenerated religion.

LEADERS OF WIDENING CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT. By Miss AGNES MAULIE MACHAR (*Andover Review*).—It is not our purpose to give any sketch of the life of John McLeod Campbell which Miss Machar presents in such an appreciative and sympathetic spirit. But there is in her article an outline of the position and arguments in McLeod Campbell's most famous book, and this cannot fail to interest our readers, and it may be specially helpful to those whose minds are engaged just now on the Atonement questions. McLeod Campbell's great work, *The Nature of the Atonement*, was written in 1855, after a prolonged and comprehensive course of preparatory reading. The germs of it may be found in his earlier writings which deal with the subject.

The work is from beginning to end a protest—not negative, but positive—against the artificial conception of the Atonement as an "arrangement" by which sinners may be relieved from penalties due to sin, through the transfer of punishment to a Diving Redeemer, believed in as a substitute for their own endless punishment. His main thesis is to show that "it was the spiritual essence and nature of the sufferings of Christ, and not that these sufferings were penal which constituted their value as entering into the Atonement made by the Son of God when He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." It is a *spiritual* as opposed to a *mechanical* conception, and therefore one which does not stop at the surface, but reaches down to the nature and heart of things.

The original source of failure in the more artificial and limited systems to grasp a true conception of the Atonement has arisen from inadequate conceptions of its nature. Mr. Campbell holds as false and inadequate the view which maintains (1) that the sufferings of Christ were *penal* and *substitutionary*; and (2) that justification is a mere alteration of "legal standing" instead of a working in us of the realization of the longings of a Father's heart, and consequently taking out of the Atonement its revelation of the character of God as *Love*, as the righteous *Father*, seeking in us the realization of His holy and loving will.

Conscience responds or witnesses to the revelation of ourselves made to us in the Gospel; to the needs-be for an atonement, retrospective and prospective, and the gift of eternal life. The vague self-reproach felt in the comparative spiritual darkness of heathendom is contrasted with that keen sense of sin which arises on coming into the full light of the moral law of love to God and man. The appreciation of the gift of eternal life implies a development of conscience and clearness of inward light beyond even the fullest reception of Scripture teaching on sin, guilt, and eternal death; yet a development of which the conscience is quite capable. And as ordinary religion, so-called, is too ready to resolve itself into a struggle to secure an unknown future happiness, all true preaching should be directed to raise the conscience to the appreciation of the glorious spiritual reality of eternal life.

Dealing with the objection that the doctrine of the Atonement seems to introduce an unnecessary complication into the simplicity of God's love and forgiveness, representing the love of God as not at liberty freely to express itself, but as having difficulties and hindrances to encounter, the removal of which involved such an unfathomable mystery as the incarnation and self-sacrifice of the Son of God, Mr. Campbell appeals to the awakened conscience of man as evidence that the very elements in the Atonement which cause difficulty are the very elements which give its power to be that peace and hope for man which the Gospel contemplates, and which a simple intimation of the Divine clemency and goodness could not quicken in him. It is that God is contemplated as manifesting clemency and goodness at a great cost, and not by a simple act of will that costs nothing, that gives the Atonement its great power over the heart of man. While the very holiness and righteousness of God do seem to interpose difficulties in the way of the full forgiveness of sin, there is, on the other hand, a truth too often ignored, that that very holiness which, by its repugnance to sin, would seem to banish the sinners to outer darkness, must, by virtue of its very essence, desire that the sinner should cease to be sinful. There is hope for him, therefore, not from the love and mercy of God alone, but from His very holiness and righteousness. Mr. Campbell's own words may be given: "Not that it tends to make an atonement less necessary, but that it may greatly affect the nature of the Atonement required; for it implies that the prospective aspect of the Atonement—its reference to the life of sonship given in Christ—has been its most important aspect as respects the demands of righteousness and holiness, as it confessedly is as respects those of mercy and love. This is so; while, assuredly, it is also true that the retrospective aspect of the Atonement as connecting the pardon of sin with the vindication of the honour of the Divine law is not less a meeting of a demand of Divine love than of the demands of righteousness and holiness. How could it be otherwise, seeing that the law is love."

Miss Macher does not attempt to give an outline of the critical or constructive portion of the book, nor to follow out Mr. Campbell's illustrations of his positions by the partial history of the life and work of Christ, the continuity of His life of Sonship, His ministry as the outcoming of that life—the mysterious sufferings which suggest "not a wrath coming forth from the Father, but a power of evil which the Father permitted to have its course, and yet which was to be met, not in the might of power at all, but in the might of realized perfect weakness, whose only strength was the strength of faith, as is conclusively shown in the words of Christ Himself when about to meet the hour and power of darkness: 'And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with Me.'"

In the close of his volume, Mr. Campbell brings his readers to that ultimate rest in the love of the Father which is too often obscured by interposing the idea

of "legal standing," and imputation of Christ's merits. "Yes, indeed, our right confidence in the Father is *direct*, and is confidence in His Fatherly heart towards us, as also our confidence in the Son is *direct*, namely, our confidence in Him as our proper life."

Mr. Campbell's was an epoch-making book. It is unfortunate that its style is so involved, the reverse of epigrammatic; and perhaps the representative human character of Christ has come into greater prominence since his day, and has given a new direction to speculation on the nature of the Atonement. But no student of that subject can afford to neglect Mr. Campbell's most spiritual and suggestive book.

CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By DUNLOP MOORE, Lansdowne, Pa. (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*).—The subject of the inerrancy of Scripture is now prominent. Calvinism can be held only on the supposition of the infallibility of the Bible. Calvin was no daring speculator in theology; never was there a man more submissive to what he believed to be Divine revelation. Dr. Schaff says, "Calvin, though one of the most logical minds, cared less for logic than for the Bible, and it is his obedience to the Word of God as the infallible rule of faith that induced him to accept the *decretum horribile* against his wish and will." Low views of the inspiration of Scripture have generally characterized latitudinarian divines. We see this in Castellio and others in the time of Calvin; in Clericus and his party in a later age; and the concurrence is strikingly exemplified in our own time. Arminius said, "Calvin is incomparable in the interpretation of Scripture." There is a strong presumption that Calvin held the Bible to contain the truth of God without any admixture of error. Guizot, in his *Life of Calvin*, finds fault with his doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

It is, however, now asserted that the first reformers of the sixteenth century freely conceded the existence of errors in the sacred writings; and Calvin has been singled out as holding free views on the subject of inspiration. How far is this true? In expounding Scripture, Calvin manifested a singular freedom from doctrinal bias, and he was careful to note difficulties. He had to confront the passages which modern critics condemn as tainted with error. He could not have avoided letting his judgment be clearly known on the question of the inerrancy of Scripture. But has he done so? His tendency was conservative; his great aim was the setting forth of positive truth. Whatever was delivered in the sacred Scriptures ought, in his judgment, to be received with meekness and docility, and without exception; he would give no room for the exercise of the so-called "Christian consciousness" in discriminating Divine truth from human error in the Bible. He taught that whatever is recorded in Scripture is to be held by us as the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and as written for our learning.

On the passage 2 Tim. iii. 16 Calvin says, "This is the import of the first clause, that the same reverence is due to Scripture which we pay to God, because it flowed from Him alone, and has no admixture of what is human." On 1 Peter i. 25 he says, "God wished to speak to us by apostles and prophets, and their mouths are the mouth of the one God." On Acts i. 16, 20 he says, "Such forms of speaking win greater reverence for the Scriptures, while we are admonished that David and all the prophets spake under the sole direction of the Spirit, so that they themselves are not the authors of the prophecies, but the Spirit who used their tongue as an instrument."

On the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith Calvin expressed his judgment with clearness and force. In his commentary on John xx. 9, he affirms that the Scripture is so full and complete in every part that any defect in our faith is to be

ascribed to our ignorance of Scripture. He admitted that there might be in the works and words of God and Christ what would not agree with our understanding. In such a case we are not, with unbridled boldness, to clamour against it, but rather to preserve a modest silence until that which is hidden from us is made known from heaven. The fact that the human author of a book of Scripture was not known did not give Calvin any anxiety, or make him disposed to question its Divine authority. He denied the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but he contended for its apostolic authority. In regard to 2 Peter, he inclines to the view that it was composed by one of the disciples of Peter, at his instigation, when he was very old, and thus bears his name. While mentioning the doubts about James and Jude, he maintains the authority of both.

Calvin makes God to such a degree the Author of Scripture that all its peculiarities of diction and choice of materials have His sanction. The marks of apparent defect in Scripture he deliberately attributes to the Divine intention; and from this point of view an inspired error is utterly inconceivable. As to the diversities observed in the Gospels, it is the constant contention of Calvin that it never amounts to a contradiction between them. He never acknowledges irreconcilable discrepancies. He has a solution for every difficulty that he can discover. In treating the genealogy of Christ in Matthew, he admits error through the carelessness or fault of copyists, but he does not concede that there existed any error in the two genealogies in the original Gospels, and he attempts a solution of every apparent discrepancy now found in them. In the varying accounts of the resurrection he sees nothing contradictory. In his works there is not a single example of apparent disagreement between the Gospels which Calvin pronounces incapable of a satisfactory solution.

In regard to the quotation of the Old Testament in the New, Calvin acknowledges the freedom with which this is done by the Apostles; but he is careful to show that they never make an unjustifiable or improper use of the Old Testament. He would not admit that a New Testament writer was liable to error in his exposition of Old Testament Scripture. We are not to exclude Divine inspiration from any part of Scripture, on the ground that the *language* is unworthy of the God of glory. He can humble Himself to employ our low forms of speech.

But it is now asserted as an indisputable fact that Calvin freely confesses that there are mistakes in the Bible. For instance, Van Oosterzee says, "Errors and inaccuracies in matters of subordinate importance are undoubtedly to be found in the Bible. A Luther, a Calvin, a Coccejus, among the older theologians; a Tholuck, a Neander, a Lange, a Stier among the modern ones, have admitted it without hesitation." And Farrar says, Calvin "did not hold the theory of verbal dictation. He will never defend or harmonize what he regards as oversight or mistake in the sacred writers." Calvin does admit that the name "Jeremiah" *crept in* to Matt. xxvii. 9, and that it is an error for "Zechariah"; but he evidently holds a corruption of the original text of Scripture. Calvin does not charge an error on Matthew, or on God who spake by him. On Acts vii. 16 Calvin says, "It is well known that there is an error in the name Abraham." But he only admits the existence of a mistake, he does not charge it to the Evangelist. It is a copyist's error, which is to be corrected.

It is said, What advantage is there in resting in the belief that the autographs of the books of Scripture were free from error if the text as we now have it is not such? We reply that if the Scriptures in their original form were errorless, we can believe that God was their author. Writing on 1 Cor. vii. Calvin shows that the Apostle does not in this chapter express any doubt as to his own inspiration, or confess that he sets

forth in any case his own private opinions which were not to be regarded as Divine oracles. He will not concede that the Apostle anywhere in his epistles delivers a merely human counsel or fallible judgment. Calvin has been sharply censured for not distinguishing properly between the different parts of the Bible. Farrar more especially makes this a leading point.

How may Scripture be certainly known as the Word of God? Its self-evidencing power is strongly asserted by the Reformer. He strenuously contends against the doctrine that the deference due to Scripture depends on the authority of the Church and its determination. The perfect conviction of the pious that God is the Author of Scripture is derived not from human reasons, or judgments, or conjectures, but from the secret testimony of the Spirit. This is the highest proof of Scripture. The only true faith is that which the Spirit seals in our hearts. Those inwardly taught by the Spirit acquiesce completely in Scripture, and do not ask for arguments or probabilities. Scripture is credible in itself, and is seen to be such by those enlightened by the Spirit. But while Calvin speaks deprecatingly of human reasons for establishing the truth of Scripture *in comparison with the secret testimony of the Spirit*, he yet regards them as very strong and convincing, and sufficient to *reduce to silence* those who deny the Divine origin of Scripture. He professes his own ability to silence the most cunning contemners of Scripture, and to refute their cavils without much difficulty.

He goes too far when he represents it as a great insult to the Holy Spirit to doubt that His inward testimony is sufficient to decide absolutely the books that ought to be admitted into the canon of Holy Scripture. We are not prepared to admit that the inward testimony of the Spirit makes it evident, without human testimony, that *every* book of the Bible was written by Divine inspiration. We do well to maintain that there is a self-evidencing power in Scripture to those taught by the Spirit of God; but this does not render superfluous the process of historical proof which Christian apologists, Calvin himself among them, have been wont to employ.

A WORLD OUTSIDE OF SCIENCE. By THOS. WENTWORTH HIGGINSON, Cambridge, Mass. (*The New World*).—We live in an age of science. It is said that modern science has transformed the world of thought; it certainly has transformed the world of action. The advance of science has gone hand in hand with the progress of democracy. Beneficent or baleful, saving or slaying, the sway of science has come. With this has naturally come a shifting of the old standards of education, and the claim that science, as such, is exclusively to rule the world. The writer recalls to mind the effect on Darwin of devotion to one branch of scientific research. It was simply that on the whole side of his intellectual being was paralyzed, a loss which all the healthy enjoyment of the other side could scarcely repay. "Yet it is possible that the lesson of Darwin's limitations may be scarcely less valuable than that of his achievements. By his strength he revolutionized the world of science. By his weakness he gave evidence that there is *a world outside of science*." We cannot deny that Darwin represented the highest type of scientific mind. Nor can we deny the value and validity of what he *ignored*. It would be easy to multiply testimonies from high scientific authority to this limitation and narrowing of the purely scientific mind. The following is by Clarence King, formerly Director of the United States Geological Survey: "With all its novel powers and practical sense, I am obliged to admit that the purely scientific brain is miserably mechanical; it seems to have become a splendid sort of self-directed machine, an incredible automaton, grinding on with its analyses or constructions. But for pure sentiment, for all that spontaneous,

joyous Greek waywardness of fancy, for the temperature of passion and the subtle thrill of ideality, you might as well look to a cast-iron derrick." For all these, then, we must come back to the world *outside* science.

If there be an intellectual world outside of science, where is the boundary line of that world? We pass that boundary whenever we enter the realm called intuitive or inspirational, a realm whose characteristic it is that it is not subject to processes or measurable by tests. The yield of this other world may be as real as that of the scientific world, but its methods are not traceable, nor are its achievements capable of being duplicated by the mere force of patient will. Science cannot tell us how "Macbeth" or "Hamlet" came into existence, or reveal the mystery of any poetical or artistic creation. But if poetry represents a world outside science, is there nothing else outside? There is unquestionably much in common between the poetic impulse, the impulse of religious emotion, and the ethical or moral instinct, if instinct it be. Dr. Lewis G. Janes says that "the art-impulse, spontaneous, vital, creative, breaks through the bonds of constraining legalism and restores the soul to freedom." But after the art-impulse has burst through and claimed its place in that world, who knows but the *devout*-impulse, at least, may also take its place by the side of the art-impulse, and the soul be restored to freedom in good earnest? And if the devout-impulse takes its place with the poetic, why may not the ethical emotion take its place also? "At present, the followers of Mr. Herbert Spencer claim to have utterly captured, measured, and solved it from the point of view of science; and they dismiss the whole conception of Intuitive Morals as completely as Bentham thought he had annihilated the word *ought*, when he said frankly, fifty years ago, that it was meaningless, and should be expunged from the English language, or, at least, from the vocabulary of morals." An American Spencerian declares that "the moral sense is not ultimate, but derivative; it has been built up out of slowly organized experiences of pleasure or pain." But if this is all that the most modern phase of science can offer, it seems to be an involuntary admission that science has here stepped beyond its limits, and that it may be necessary to remand not only poetry and religion, but ethics, to the world that lies *outside*.

NOTE ON THEISM. By Prof. NOAH K. DAVIS, University of Virginia (*Christian Thought*).—Hypothesis plays an important and prominent part in scientific investigation. It is an approved feature of the inductive process. Much of physical science is built up on hypotheses that have not been established; and some of these hypotheses, by their very nature, can never become demonstrated theories. It is an error to mistake hypothesis, which is mere supposition, for theory, which is demonstrated truth; but it is legitimate to use hypothesis in an inductive search after truth, and to hold a good hypothesis firmly even where the procedure falls short of demonstration. "Newton made an hypothesis concerning the cause of celestial motions. First, he assumed a *vera causa*, that is, a cause known to be by proof apart from the hypothesis. Second, he proved that his hypothesis fully explained the facts. Third, he proved that no other hypothesis could possibly explain the facts. By this third step, what before was merely hypothesis, became demonstrated truth. It is one of the few cases in which hypothesis has logically passed into theory." The undulatory hypothesis of Huygens or Young explains the phenomena of light. But the proof that no other hypothesis will explain the facts is lacking, and the cause supposed, the luminiferous ether, has not been shown to be a *vera causa*. The development hypothesis is as old as Anaximander. Darwin assigned for it a cause, natural selection combined with it heredity, and proved that

this is a *vera causa*. But the hypothesis is imperfect, for it does not fully explain the facts; and it cannot be regarded as exclusive, for it has rivals.

When we look abroad on the world of nature and of history we behold a bewildering multitude, a vast complexus of facts and events. We inquire into the origin of this world of phenomena. Only two hypotheses have been offered—that of an infinite regressus of causes, and that of a personal first cause. The first of these merely pushes the explanation back and away out of reach, in effect denying that it is attainable. The hypothesis of a personal first cause fully, completely, and sufficiently explains all the phenomena, and so has the first mark of a legitimate and good hypothesis. It also has a *vera causa*, i.e., a cause well known to exist independently of the hypothesis in question. Every person knows himself and his fellows to be causes, original causes, creators or builders of new things from materials at hand. If we could take Newton's last step, and prove strictly that no other hypothesis can possibly explain the facts, then this hypothesis would become a theory, a logically-demonstrated truth. No rival hypothesis is proposed, but this in strictness is not sufficient; there must be direct proof that no other can explain the facts. The hypothesis is, however, strictly legitimate and scientific. It is better than the hypothesis of a luminiferous ether, for it posits a *vera causa*. It is better than the development hypothesis, for it explains all the facts, and it has no rival.

Standing on the same inductive basis as the sciences of light and natural history, with the excellences of both, and the defects of neither, how can physicists and naturalists reject theism? Bacon, the founder of induction, says, "It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity." La Place, when asked by Napoleon why he made no mention of God in his *Mécanique Céleste*, replied, "Sire, I had no need of that hypothesis." The astronomer may not, but the man and mankind have. Said Voltaire, "If there were no God (though all nature cries out that He is) it would be necessary to invent Him." Upon this hypothetical basis let Him stand so long as the physical sciences stand.

We have taken very humble ground. The unity of the Deity, that He is more than a demiurge building the world out of matter already at hand, and that He is infinite in glorious attributes, are points not touched in this note. It only posits hypothetically a personal first cause. As initiative and a simple attendant upon other proofs, this seems to be reasonable, and likely to be helpful.

CURRENT CANADIAN THOUGHT.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S ATONEMENT. By Rev. W. JACKSON, Perth, Ont. (*The Canadian Methodist Quarterly*).—This article is introductory to an endeavour to form a consistent Arminian Methodist theory. It is interesting and suggestive as treating some of those primary questions on which those who would discuss this great doctrine need to be agreed. It is manifest that those argue hopelessly who have not fixed the connotation of their terms God, and Law, and Sin. This article is discursive, but it brings some points of grave importance into view.

Considered as a doctrine, the Atonement is to Christianity what the keystone is to the arch, the bond that constitutes it a unit, the secret of its strength, and the crown of its symmetrical proportions. Considered as a life, the Atonement is to Christianity what the heart is to the human body, the fountain whence it springs, and the motive power by which it acts. It is simply impossible to think about the Atonement without building up a theory; the moment we begin to think, that moment we begin to theorize. Dr. Dale says, "To speculate is perilous, not to speculate may be more perilous still."

No discussion of Atonement can be of much value that either ignores, or slightly deals with, the question of God's moral government. The fact of a moral government is established by an appeal to man's nature and environment. The arguments of Bishop Butler have never been superseded or answered. Man's moral nature implies a basis or standard of righteousness prior to it, a standard to which the consciousness of each individual makes its appeal. This standard of righteousness must centre in a person; no abstraction meets the requirements of the case. What is the nature of that law which man is under obligations to obey? M. Littré, as a physicist, says, "When we have discovered a general fact in the forces or properties of matter, we say that we are in possession of a law." Blackstone, as a jurist, says, "Law is a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a State, commanding what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong." Mr. Austin, as another jurist, defines law as "a rule laid down for the guidance of an intelligent being by an intelligent being having power over him." We may say that "moral law is the rule of conduct laid down by the Supreme Sovereign for the regulation of the lives of all His moral creatures, commanding what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong, the observance or breach of this rule determining the relation of the subject to the Sovereign." The essential elements of moral law indicated in this definition are—rightful authority on the part of the lawgiver, the obligation to obedience on the part of the subject, associated with the utmost freedom of action. Herein lies the essential difference between what, by an admissible figure, are called physical laws, and those designated moral; the former represents but one will, that of the lawgiver; the latter represents the will of the ruled as well as that of the ruler. What men call natural laws are but the modes in which Divine power operates in the material universe. The indestructible distinction between so-called physical and moral law is that the former intimates what actually and universally *is*, the latter what *ought to be*. Law signifies that which is *laid down*, fixed, or appointed by the sovereign authority. It contemplates the possibility of willing obedience to a command, or conformity to a rule, necessarily implying the possibility of disobedience. Its application to nature is therefore figurative, since in the working of nature there is neither disobedience nor nonconformity. We must keep this essential difference between the law of force and the law of command perpetually before our minds.

The philosophical discussions concerning the origin of moral obligation require to be noticed. To understand them, we must distinguish between moral law and moral government. Law is the truth by which intelligent responsible beings ought to shape their conduct; whereas government is the authoritative declaration of the truth by which moral subjects ought to regulate their life, such a declaration as enforces obedience to its commands by appropriate sanctions. We distinguish between law as the eternal principle of right and law as the governmental application of these principles of right to particular instances. Admit the most generally-accepted view, that moral law takes its rise in the will of God, then the disciple of Herbert Spencer might say, "Then, were there no knowledge of the Divine

will, the acts now known as wrong would not be known as wrong." This theory makes the will of God the standard of His own perfections, whereas the Divine perfections are the limit and rule of the Divine will. And it may be added, that no act of will can create a moral obligation; there must be antecedent obligation to give any command the force and authority of law.

But why does God will as He does? Dr. Dale's distinction between the conscience and the will of man—the former recognizing the authority of what he calls "the eternal law of righteousness," and the latter the personal authority of God—is arbitrary; one which finds no warrant from the facts of man's nature, the experiences of human life, or the pages of inspiration. It seems an indisputable axiom that what is the true for the reason is the right for the will. What the Divine Reason perceives to be true, that the Divine Will chooses as right. Here, we imagine, is the fountain whence law takes its rise; and this is the true relation of the Divine Will to law. But while moral law does not originate in the Will of God, it is here seen to be inseparable from His person. It has its roots in His being, its embodiment in His character, and its expression in His government. The only objection that can be urged against this position is that it puts law above God. But, "in appealing to the Divine nature, we do not affirm that God was necessitated to create, as if He were subject to the constraint of a superior power, or as if His power were not exercised in accordance with will; it is simply affirmed that the action of Deity must be in accordance with the perfection of His own nature—can never fall beneath it."

The violation of moral law cannot be permitted with impunity. This is evident from the penal sanctions attached to it. We have no disposition to exalt law above God. But law does not express the entire relations which exist between God and His moral creatures. And yet some theories of Atonement are built upon that assumption. God is also the Father of men, and we claim that the Fatherhood is the primary relation of God to men, and that all the other relations exist for the purpose of carrying out the beneficent ends of the Fatherhood. The Fatherhood does not change the sovereignty, but it does qualify it. We must also keep in mind the Divine prerogative. It is true that no act of mere prerogative can set a sinner right in his relation to God and law; yet, unless law leaves room for the exercise of prerogative, no atonement would be possible, salvation for the sinful would be out of the question. It is a theological fiction which represents one attribute or prerogative of the Deity as in conflict with another. There is not a single intimation in Holy Scripture that any perfection of the Deity was in any way opposed to the sinner's recovery from sin. John Calvin and his followers have fastened their gaze on the sovereignty of God, but they have failed to see that it is the sovereignty of a Divine Fatherhood.

What, then, is the precise relation of atonement to moral law? Does it provide for the salvation of the sinner by the substitute's enduring the penalty which the law pronounced as the just desert of transgression? This is not the same as asking, Did the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ answer the ends of law as well as the punishment of the transgressor would have done? The question now before us is, Did Christ bear the actual penalty due to the sins of the elect? If He did not, He must have endured something in its stead; but in that case the claims of law must have been relaxed, if not dispensed with. The Atonement is not so much an affair of law as of sovereign will, as is evidenced by the entire voluntariness of the Redeemer Himself. The intervention of Christ for man's salvation does not consist in anything He has done to relax or dispense with law; but by the sacrifice of Himself He procures the delay of the execution of the penal sanctions of the broken

law, and offers grace adequate for the restoration of the sinful to the image as well as to the favour of God. We claim that this view exalts the Divine law, and brings out its immutability as no other does, making man's motives to obedience stronger than ever.

THE BIBLE, THE CHURCH, AND THE REASON. By Rev. W. S. BLACKSTOCK, Toronto, Ont. (*The Canadian Methodist Quarterly*).—This is a review of the work, bearing the same title, written by Dr. Briggs, which was the occasion of charges of heresy in the Presbyterian courts of the United States. We have no concern with that matter, but we may usefully follow Mr. Blackstock in his endeavour to set forth, without prejudice, the actual teachings of the book.

Dr. Briggs maintains the complete independence of the Holy Scriptures, as carrying with them the means of their own authentication and interpretation. He takes equally strong ground respecting the self-interpreting power of the Holy Scriptures, accompanied by the illumination and guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Church is a great fountain of authority, but is not a revealer or discoverer of the will of God. It neither gives authority to the Holy Scriptures, nor is it the divinely authorized interpreter of their meaning. But there is something through which God makes Himself, in some sense, known to men, and His authority felt by them, other than either the Bible or the Church. His converse with man began before either of these had an existence, and there is no reason to doubt that He converses with them still where both the Bible and the Church are unknown. The distinction between right and wrong, and the sense of moral obligation, are universal. The word "ought," or its equivalents, are found in every language. This universal sense of obligation and accountability suggests the idea of some One, not ourselves, to whom we are accountable. Man is everywhere a religious being. This Divine thing in man Dr. Briggs calls the *Reason*. He does not mean the understanding or logical faculty, but rather the intuitive part of our spiritual being, that by which we see and know things, of which we can give no other account or proof but simply that we see them and know them. It is this Divine element through which God speaks to the individual soul—"the light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world"—which lifts man above the plane of merely intellectual animal existence, and makes him a proper subject for religious instruction. The Bible, the Church, and the Reason are the three great media through which God speaks to man, the three grand instruments by which He produces conviction and certitude in the human soul. These are not co-ordinate fountains of authority, or on the same level. The Bible alone is the infallible rule of faith and practice. The mediæval Christian had the Church and the Sacraments, but had not the Bible, and knew little of its contents, yet he often attained to a real saintliness of character. There may be those without the Church who find the Bible, with the illuminating influence of the Holy Spirit, a sufficient support for their faith. And it may be reasonable to admit that there are cases in which men who have failed to find rest in either the Bible or the Church have found it in the Reason, or in that faculty of the soul which brings it, as it were, face to face with God. Of this class Dr. James Martineau is suggested as an example.

Of course, the normal state of things is that in which these all operate in harmony and conjunction. They may be separated as matters of thought, but they are too closely united in the great saving work which the moral Governor of the world is carrying on among men to be separated in practice. However clearly the Christian finds himself indebted to the Bible and the Church, he will find, if he carries the analysis of his experience far enough, that these do but bring the soul into direct

personal contact with God Himself, in the person of the Holy Spirit, and make him feel his immediate, absolute, and continuous dependence upon Him, and Him alone.

As to the question of the inerrancy of Scripture, Dr. Briggs says that the Scripture makes no such claim for itself, and no orthodox creed has ever made such claim for it. He recognizes its supremacy in the domain of faith and morals, and admits that it contains errors in minor matters. "If one should find errors of chronology and geography, of historical statement and description of events, of geology and astronomy, of natural history and archæology, they would not be in contravention of the statement that the Scriptures are the only and infallible rule of faith and practice." The errors are in circumstantial, not in essentials.

It may even be urged that the inaccuracies and errors in minor matters add to the trustworthiness of the Scriptures, for they show the absolute genuineness and simplicity of their narrations. Of course, many so-called errors are mere slips of the copyists, but when these are discounted there remain inaccuracies in the actual substance of the writings; but they are not such as to shake the faith of any well-balanced mind in the entire trustworthiness of the Word of God. "They indicate that the authority of God, and His gracious discipline, transcend the highest possibilities of human speech and writing; and that the religion of Jesus Christ is not the religion of the Bible, but the religion of personal union and communion with the living God."

"Let us have faith in God, and we shall have faith in His Word, and its ability to endure the severest strain that can be put upon it. But in our zeal for the defence of the Holy Scriptures it may be possible for us to load them with responsibilities that the inspired writers themselves have not assumed. We should not claim less for these writers than they claim for themselves; but we should be careful not to claim more. We should hold them strictly responsible for the exact and infallible correctness of what they professed to be inspired of God to teach. But to go beyond this, and to assert of them and for them what they do not assert for and of themselves, is surely to assume a grave responsibility, and to impose a strain upon the faith of honest students of the Bible which it ought not to be called upon to bear. It should be remembered that the writers of the sacred books were the religious teachers of the age in which they lived. As such their paramount duty was to instruct their own contemporaries. But in order to do this, one of two things was necessary—either for them to adapt their teaching to the existing state of knowledge, or to teach the people to whom they were sent a perfect system of science, of history, and indeed of everything pertaining to the secular aspects of human life, as a preliminary step in the process of instruction. But as the latter was impossible, they were by necessity shut up to the former." They could have been no teachers of their age if they had spoken in any other than the sphere of associations which belonged to their age.

CURRENT GERMAN THOUGHT.

WENDT'S POSITION ON THE JOHANNINE QUESTION. By Dr. E. HAUPT, Halle (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1893, No. 2).—The theory of the fourth Gospel on which Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus* proceeds is that the discourses of Christ which it contains come from St. John, but that these have been edited by a later hand, and that the difference between the two parts of the Gospel is plainly discernible by certain marks. The Matthew-Logia and John-Logia together give us the genuine teaching

of Jesus, and the two are in essential harmony. The grounds of this theory are stated in the first part of Wendt's work, which has not been translated. Dr. Haupt subjects this theory to a long and searching criticism in the above article, and, while commending the sincerity and ability of the author and the attractiveness of many of his suggestions in the highest terms, comes to a decidedly adverse conclusion. "The reasons given do not prove the case; the alleged difficulties are capable of other explanations; the Johannine authorship is still the most probable theory," is in substance the conclusion he comes to. We can, of course, give only specimens of his reasoning.

The two principal reasons adduced by Wendt for this theory are (1) the existence of passages which interrupt the order of thought, and so look like interpolations, and (2) the different conceptions of the same subjects found in the Gospel.

A good example of the first is John i. 15, which at first sight seems to break the connection between two closely-related passages. The phraseology and import of ver. 16 seem to join on to ver. 14, not ver. 15. Wendt also points out that vers. 14 and 16 base Christ's superiority on a fact of experience; ver. 15 bases it on authority. Haupt replies, first, by asking how, if ver. 15 be omitted, the "for" of ver. 16 is to be explained. Our receiving of His fulness cannot be the cause or reason of our beholding His glory, but the reverse; and if it is supposed that the original reading was "and," not "for," how could a difficult reading like the latter be put for a simpler one? And, still further, supposing with Wendt the connection between vers. 14 and 16 to be so close, why did the editor interrupt it by inserting ver. 15 here, instead of after ver. 17? The discussion of ver. 15 goes along with that of vers. 6-8, which also relate to the Baptist, and which Wendt is also obliged to assign to the later editor; but in this case the "true" of ver. 9 loses its support, for it only has any meaning as it expresses a contrast with the Baptist of vers. 6-8. Moreover, if vers. 6-8 be removed, the emphasis would fall on the light *coming* into the world, though this is contrary to the order of the words; and after it has been said, in ver. 5, that the light is already shining, it is superfluous to say that it is coming into the world.

Haupt suggests another explanation of the entire passage. Assuming that the prologue, vers. 1-5, is a complete whole, as it seems to be, describing as it does the true nature of the Word, ver. 6 then begins the historical narrative. There is every appearance of this. The opening, "There came a man," is as formal as possible. There is nothing parenthetical about it. But the remark, "He was not the light," suggests the twofold reception which the light met with in the world; this is the subject of vers. 9-14. Then in ver. 15 the Evangelist resumes the narrative of ver. 8 in order to give the actual testimony which the Baptist bore to the true light. Then again, in vers. 16-18, the Evangelist interrupts his narrative in order still further to illustrate the thought just uttered, viz., the eminent position of Christ. It will be seen that Haupt precisely reverses the view of the passage taken by Wendt, making vers. 6-8 and ver. 15 the narrative proper, and vers. 9-14 and 16-18 parenthetical explanations. Vers. 16-18 bear just the same relation to ver. 15 as 9-14 do to vers. 6-8. We cannot reproduce the minute analysis by which Haupt supports his position, but can only say that the exposition seems exceedingly natural. If so, it completely upsets the proof derived from this passage by Wendt for his theory of the composition of the Gospel.

We may mention one or two points of interest in the exposition. Ver. 14 does not begin a new section. This could only be the case if the previous verses referred to the pre-incarnate Word. But they do not, for vers. 12, 13 state one great spiritual

result of the incarnation. Haupt places the emphasis of ver. 14 on the "beholding," of which the becoming flesh and tabernacling among us are presuppositions. After dwelling in vers. 12, 13 on results of the incarnation, it would be strange to go back in ver. 14 to the fact itself as the chief thought. Let it also be noted that in ver. 5 the point of incarnation is reached; the shining of the light assumes its presence. Ver. 5 really indicates the subject of the entire Gospel. "In each one of its main parts the shining of the light, offering itself to the world, and the non-reception by the world, are set forth."

The other passages in the Gospel, adduced by Wendt as interpolations, are subjected to a similar analysis, xiii. 16-20, vi. 27 ff., vii. 15-24, viii. 12 ff., xii. 44 ff. Each one of these is discussed in detail. In the first passage Haupt acknowledges that vers. 18, 19 have no connection with the context; ver. 20 joins on to ver. 16, although he would prefer to say that ver. 20 looks more like a later addition. But then, why should a later editor insert vers. 18 and 19 so incongruously? In point of fact, the Gospel contains many examples of passages apparently brought together by the writer on some other ground than inner connection of thought. Here the purpose seems to be "to show how the thought of the traitor filled the mind of Jesus that evening. Hence it breaks out on every occasion. The entire thought of the example of Jesus, which the disciples are to follow, reminds Him that it does not hold good for all: one is present, to whom Jesus is no example, who does not inwardly belong to this circle." In all the other cases Dr. Haupt first criticizes the explanation given by Dr. Wendt, and then gives a counter explanation. One thing is certain, that, on Dr. Wendt's theory, the editor or reviser was a man of the weakest capacity; no one else would have deliberately introduced passages having no connection with the context.

Wendt attaches greater importance to his second argument—that the discourses of Christ in the fourth Gospel, and the supposed editorial additions, exhibit different religious views. The first example given is that of "signs" and "works." In the discourses "sign" is secondary or absent, "work" prominent; in the other parts the case is reversed. This, it is argued, is more than a verbal difference, it is a difference of conception. The reference to "sign" finds the proof of Christ's Divine authority simply in His miraculous acts; the use of the term "work" synonymously with word (*ῥῆμα*) finds it in Christ's ethical work.

Haupt altogether disputes the interpretation here given both of signs and works. The former are not displays of mere power, but always have a moral aim as well. It is so in the raising of Lazarus, the healing of the blind man, the miracle at the pool, the feeding of the multitude, the nobleman's son. The first miracle was to confirm faith in Christ as the resurrection and the life, and in all the other cases some moral end is answered. "From this it follows that no single miraculous account has merely the character of a display of power, but all, even those which Wendt ascribes to the editor, seek to reveal the moral and religious character of Jesus. Moreover, several of these—that of Lazarus, the blind man, the feeding—are used as allegories of what Jesus is willing to do in the inner sphere, and that at Bethesda at least as a proof of what He can do in the higher sphere." The same is true of the miracles of knowledge, as in the case of the Samaritan and Nathanael; in both there are moral ends in view. "It is therefore highly improbable that the editor understood by sign miraculous acts merely as manifestations of a higher power. Rather these mighty acts are called signs, as speaking a language of signs; they are not signs of higher power, but these mighty acts in the natural sphere are signs of what Jesus is or will do in a higher sphere. Just for the peculiar character of the Johannine miracles there

is no apter designation than this one. As in the Synoptists Jesus wishes to reveal heavenly things in the parables, but the people do not understand them, but stop at the outward history; so in John the miracles are meant to be signs, but the people only see wonders in them."

Haupt also contends against the identifying of "works" and "words." Wendt's proof-passage is xiv. 10 f., which is not conclusive. Another view of the meaning is that Christ sets the words and works beside each other: I speak not from Myself, I act not from Myself; both are from the Father. Of course, the works embrace, not merely the miracles, but also the entire saving work of Christ, iv. 34, v. 20, 36, ix. 3. But elsewhere the miracles are evidently the chief thing thought of, vii. 3, 21, x. 32, 37. On the other hand, there is no case in which the words of Jesus are described by the substantive "work." The "greater works" of v. 20 are not words in distinction from miracles, but religious effects in contrast with bodily. Above all, xv. 24, compared with xv. 22, is decisive against Wendt. If the words here mean works, or are even included in them, the second saying needlessly repeats the first. "Certainly in the fourth Gospel Jesus has described *not merely* His miracles as works, but His entire work as Saviour (v. 30, 36); but it is a confusion for Wendt to suppose that His words are included therein; *not the words themselves, but their effect*, the restoring of new Divine life, is reckoned among the works. . . . The true position is almost the reverse of what Wendt thinks. By signs the miracles are scarcely ever marked out as mere displays of power, their religious import is emphasized thereby. . . . On the contrary, just in those parts which Wendt himself ascribes to the Apostle John, Jesus appeals repeatedly, under the title of works, to the miraculous side of His acts in the proper sense as a proof of His Divine mission, x. 25, 32, 37, xv. 24; not indeed as the proper proof, standing by itself in the foreground, but as the one obvious to the senses. It is thus proved that we have to do here, not with two self-contradictory modes of view, but with a deeper and fuller view of the significance of miracles as signs, and a secondary view which has the force of an *argumentatio ad homines*: If you will not believe on the higher grounds, at least believe in the miraculousness of My deeds."

Why, then, does the word "sign" occur so seldom in Christ's own discourses? "Precisely because, as it seems to me, in no passage where we read 'work' is the significant, symbolic side of the miracles meant to be emphasized." "If our exposition is correct, if the writer has aimed at exhibiting the nature of miracles not in the outward miraculous fact, but in their significance for the religious life, it is no mark of an inferior standpoint when at the close he adduces the signs as a proof of Christ's Divine Sonship. Not the wonders in their outward occurrence, but the circumstance that they are a sign-language makes them capable of being evidences of Christ's supramundane nature, of attesting Him as the possessor not merely of Divine power, but of God's saving truth."

Dr. Wendt, again, contends that the idea of faith in the discourses differs from that given by the editor. The former means, he says, the practical acknowledgment of Christ's Divine saving character, such as is shown in accepting and following His teaching; the latter the theoretical conviction of His Divine power, such as His miracles might produce. Dr. Haupt contests both points. He shows that in the portions ascribed by Wendt himself to the editor, where the faith which is the product of miracles is mentioned, it is treated as imperfect. So we are told in chap. ii. 23 that some believed on the ground of miracles, but it is added that Jesus did not commit Himself to them. In iv. 48, again, He expressly complains of the craving for this kind of evidence. In the narrative of Nathanael, also, a

higher ground of faith is referred to. As to the idea of faith in the great discourses of the fourth Gospel, Haupt thinks, first, that Wendt lowers its meaning to mere assent or consent. It is a much more inward, spiritual conception. According to chap. vi. 35, it is a coming to Christ, a feeding on Him, cleaving to Him. To let the Spirit of Christ, speaking to us in His words, really enter into and govern us; to be one with Him, not merely in action, but in our whole being—this is faith. "But this highest conception of faith does not prevent the same word being used also for inadequate beginnings of a right relation to Christ, even if they are mixed with error or only transient. This follows from the simple fact that the peculiar terminology of the author does not prevent him using also the current Christian phrases, as is the case also in Paul with reference to the same idea."

After referring to other points of the same kind, Dr. Haupt sums up: "Wendt's hypothesis of a twofold source has not been shown to be necessary at any point; in many points it is anything but successful in solving difficulties. His analysis has no sufficient basis. The result, to which he comes, is very attractive. The greatest stumbling-blocks found in the fourth Gospel disappear. The miracle at Cana, the feeding of the multitude, the details at least in the case of the blind man and Lazarus, are left with the editor. The properly historical part is found in the great discourses of Jesus, and these also lose many of their difficult elements in the exegesis of Wendt. There is left at last a remnant, which the modern mind can accept. But I must confess that this result fills me with mistrust. Not that for a moment I wish to suggest that a man like Wendt wished to arrive at such a result. He has reached it by the path of honest labour. But still it makes me distrustful: I cannot at all conceive that Jesus really thought in such modern ways. I also have the feeling that His words are robbed of the meaning which they have for an unprejudiced eye. We cannot escape from the difficulties of the fourth Gospel by the notion of a revision of historical discourses of Christ. We must accept it just as it is. We may regard it as historical, ideal-historical, unhistorical, but there is no ground for separating the several parts. I have intentionally made no reference to the question of genuineness, so as not to complicate the question. But I will not close without confessing that I come again and again to this result, that the difficulties are most easily solved on the supposition of the Johannine authorship. But it is a great gain that by the most recent labours of Wendt, Schürer, and Harnack a broad space is won, on which supporters and opponents of the genuineness may meet and work together."

THE APOSTLES' CREED. By Dr. R. F. GRAU, Königsberg (*Bew. d. Glaubens*, Jan., 1893).—A sharp controversy is raging in Germany around a pamphlet by Harnack, in which the clause, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," is virtually repudiated. A cloud of pamphlets has appeared on one side and the other. Dr. Grau emphasizes in the lecture he has given on the subject the essential Rationalism of the Ritschl school.

Dr. Grau points out, first of all, that the clauses affirming Christ's supernatural birth belonged to the earliest form of the Creed, viz., the old Roman creed, which is traceable to the first half of the second century, as Harnack himself says. Those were the days of the Apostolic Fathers, days of tradition rather than of creation. From this it is argued that the substance of the Creed may claim at least indirect Apostolic authority. It arose at the same time as the New Testament canon, and out of similar causes, as a security against false doctrines. "But if we thus go back to the original *Apostolicum*, this does not mean that its several clauses as such are the substance of our faith and the foundation of our trust. The substance of our faith

can only be a Person, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ. The Apostolicum treats of Him; He is its centre and soul. The outward form of the original Creed shows this most clearly. For whereas two clauses refer to the Father, and four to the Holy Spirit, nine treat of Christ. And again, none of these words can be taken by themselves; they utter a great mystery of faith—the nature and the work of our Lord and Saviour. Neither can be severed from the other. It is the Son of God, and Himself true God, who was nailed to the cross for us, and, moreover, He was born of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Ghost. This is the universal faith of Christendom and the faith of the simple. They could not believe in that work of salvation and a forgiveness of sins, unless they were certain that the true Son of God wrought it; and therefore also they believe in the birth from the Virgin."

The question is asked, How is it, if the miraculous birth is of the first importance, it is mentioned only in the first and third Gospels? One could scarcely expect a fact of this nature to be made very prominent. As to St. Mark's Gospel, the position given to Christ as the Son of Man, the dispenser of forgiveness, the Bridegroom of the Church, is quite in harmony with, if it does not even demand, the fact. As to St. John, are his prologue and his entire presentation of Christ consistent with a natural birth? "Or can any one suppose that the Apostle Paul, who even before the fourth Evangelist teaches the creation of the world by the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. viii. 6), yet believes that the heavenly Man, the Spirit who gives life, is inferior to the Adam created of the earth, that He is begotten of the flesh, in which dwells no good thing?" But the real answer to be given to the question asked above runs thus: "This fact is only significant for you who have come to true faith in the Lord Jesus, the historical Christ. And you cannot come to this true faith in the way and by means of that fact or doctrine. But you can come to this faith only in the way in which the Galileans came to it, namely, when you come as a sick man, to whom his sins are a burden, to this Physician, who draws near to you as a holy and yet merciful High Priest, and says to you, Thy sins are forgiven thee; arise and walk. And when you have heard and believed that He alone possesses such power to forgive sins, because He gave His soul a ransom for thee, then will the question demand an answer, Whence this unique soul, which is alone without guilt and stain, and which is able to be a ransom for all? Then you will not only be able, but compelled, to believe that this soul has a different origin from the rest, as it has a different nature, and therefore a different value. But this we must learn from our study, that the preaching of the Gospel and the teaching of the Catechism must not start from the birth of Jesus, but must first picture and impress on man's soul the glory of the only-begotten Son of God in the entire fullness of His grace and truth, in the entire riches of His merciful love and mighty help, before they can raise and answer that question."

After giving a sketch of the Scripture story of Divine revelation to and dealings with the man, the writer proceeds: "That God has given Himself in His Son for sinful humanity, the Master for His servants, the Physician for the sick, the Just for the unjust, this is the Divine folly of the Gospel, in which the essence of Christianity consists. To take away this folly at which the natural reason of all ages has stumbled, is to take the sting from the bee, but also to kill it; it is to destroy the deepest ground of our trust in God, and to take from the Gospel the power to change the old into a new man born of God (1 Cor. i. 30). This is the essential matter in the conflict about the Creed, namely, the work and nature of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The essential matter is that the work and suffering of the man Jesus are, in fact, the work and suffering of God Himself. The new school cannot confess this, because it seems too foolish to the natural reason. But to us this is the essence of

Christianity. The two clauses, 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,' have such importance in the present dispute because they cannot be evaded like the other clauses, but affirm beyond question that this man Jesus has come from above, God of God, Light of Light. Therefore opposition rises up against them. The faith of simple people cleaves to them; they feel how much is at stake. For their comfort, and the strengthening of their faith, let us hear Luther speak: 'The devil attacks Christ with three armies. One will not let Him be God. Another will not let Him be man. The other will not let Him do what He has done. Each one of the three would make Christ a cipher. For what gain is it to confess that He is God if thou dost not believe that He is man? For then thou hast not the whole real Christ, but a phantom of the devil. What gain is it to confess that He is man if thou dost not believe that He is God? What gain is it to confess that He is God and man if thou dost not believe that He became and did all this for thee? Just as it did not help some to confess that He died for us, and yet believed not that He is God (like the Arians), or not man (like the Manicheans). All three points must be believed, namely, that He is God, that He is man, that He for us became such a man, that is, as the first Creed says, Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered, was crucified, died, and rose again, &c. If one point be wanting, all are wanting. For faith is and must be whole and complete; although it may be weak and tempted, yet it must be full, and not false, which is eternal death.'" "When our opponents appeal directly to Luther, desiring to make him the authority for their deviations from the particular clauses of the Creed, two things are to be said. It is right to say that Luther in his two expositions of the second article in the small and great Catechism protests against the legal, mechanical view of our Creed such as is given in the Roman conception of faith. It is right to say that in both expositions he dwells on the central truth: He is my Lord who redeemed me, a lost and ruined man. What does this little word 'Lord' mean? That 'Jesus Christ, God's true Son,' purchased me by the surrender of His Divine life; the several parts of the article merely state 'what it cost Him to purchase us. He became man, was conceived and born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin without sin that He might overcome sin; suffered, died, and was buried, that He might satisfy for me, and pay what I owed, not with silver or gold, but with His own precious blood. And all this He did that He might be my Lord, for He did not do it or need to do it for Himself.' So it is correct to say that Luther did not insist on the several articles as such, but on a great matter, the soul of the whole article, nay, of the three articles, that is, the work of Jesus in His self-sacrifice for us, as in the shedding of His blood (Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 28). But to ascribe this work to a man, and yet to claim Luther for this view, is a daring stroke, and only to be compared with the attempt to make Luther the precursor of Rationalism. For Luther that work of redemption only has its true, comprehensive, and eternal significance so far as it is the work of the true Son of God; were it a human work it would lose its essential meaning. A deep gulf separates Luther's faith from the Ritschl school."

Dr. Grau agrees with teachers of that school when they insist, as they often do, that true faith is not bound to a formula of words, but is "simple, independent trust in a person, not in a doctrine or doctrines; devotion to God Himself, not the acceptance of an *idea* of God; the joyous certainty that God loves us, not the acknowledgment of theories about His 'attributes.'" "Yet," it is replied, "just because faith is essentially trust in a person, I must know this person if I am to trust him. Hence knowledge is united with faith, the faith which says, I know in whom I believe." The knowledge of course embraces not merely attributes, but all that is included in the completed revelation of Christ.

DR. VON FRANK ON THE SAME CONTROVERSY (*Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.* 1898, No. 1).—"Let our opponents understand that, if the opposition to the Apostolic Confession of Faith should assume wider dimensions and lead to corresponding practical measure, we should have before us a separation, in comparison with which that of the Reformation would be child's-play. It is incomprehensible to me how any one acquainted with history can imagine that, by reducing the import of the Confession, by omitting or softening the offensive points, he will bring about a union or the possibility of a peaceful co-operation. He must have ill understood the history of the conflicts about the Creed who thinks that generalizing it, by breaking off its angles, he will secure progress. Is this, forsooth, your wisdom that, by appealing to the indefiniteness and diversity at the beginning, you will take us back to that initial stage? This we know, as well as you, that whoever now believes in Jesus Christ and receives forgiveness through Him is saved, as the jailor at Philippi was saved. The jailor was not asked as to the several articles of the Creed. But are we to infer from this that the Church does not need the Creed, and ought to give it up for the sake of those who stumble at Christ's miraculous birth, or His descent into Hades, or His resurrection or ascension? To assert this is to require the Church to become childish in order to help children to understand. When Paul became a Jew to the Jews, a heathen to the heathen, he did not give up the rich evangelical knowledge he possessed, but did it on the basis of this knowledge. Faith in Jesus Christ, dying and rising again, faith in Father, Son, and Spirit, such as was given in the Baptismal formula, contains in itself from the first and actually all the elements fixed in the Creed when that formula was enlarged. The Church rightly assumed, and still assumes, that whoever surrenders himself in living faith to the living Christ, at the same time, although implicitly, yea, perhaps along with opposition arising from ignorance, holds fast Christ as He is made known in all the parts of the Creed. The Church may bear long with its weak members, tossed about with temptation and doubt; even with its ministers, who through the teaching of the present time have not reached full certainty. But it is absurd to require the Church on their account to descend from the height it has reached in the knowledge of the Gospel. To lead it to give up entirely or partially the Apostles' Creed would be to ignore the course it has traversed, and to throw it back to its earliest beginnings."

Reference is made on the other side to the slow growth of the Creed, its many variations, the different senses put upon some of its clauses, the difficulty of other clauses, in order to diminish the authority of the clauses in dispute. But there is a wide difference between the practice of the Roman Catholic Church in putting all the articles on the same level, and the Protestant way of emphasizing the central, essential truths. Dr. Frank also points out that Harnack has made no new discoveries on the subject. The objections made to the clauses in dispute do not arise from any cause of this kind, but from the old aversion to the miraculous which is characteristic of the new as of the old Rationalism. The new school "seems to start from the interesting assumption, that *if* these articles had been based on truth, the first preachers of the Gospel must have begun with saying: We preach to you the Christ who did not spring, like other men, from human parents, but was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of a virgin. We see from the beginning of Mark's Gospel, which has best preserved the original form of Gospel preaching, that this was not the case; *ergo*, &c. Precisely so, as the champions of the 'historic Christ' persuade us, *if* you believe Christ personally pre-existed, if you speak in dogmatics of the eternal Godhead of the Son, you must begin with it in practical instruction, the Apostles must have begun their mission-preaching with saying: We

preach to you One who, as the Second Person of the Divine Trinity, assumed human nature of the Virgin Mary, &c. But opponents will, perhaps, give up arguments of this kind, and permit us to abide by the faith of Christendom in the eternal Son of God and the Virgin's Son, without letting ourselves be terrified by objections of this sort. The Apostles, when they saw the person of their Master with eyes of faith, discerned in Him the eternal, Divine background of His nature; from this point, in connection with the Lord's sayings about Himself, they came to confess Him as One who was with God. And as they experienced it in themselves, so they taught it in their preaching; they did not begin with metaphysical ideas, but they were conscious of this and expressed it, that our faith in this historical Christ would be vain apart from that Divine and eternal background of His nature. To them also, as we may see in Paul's letters, it never occurred in their mission-preaching to prefix the testimony to Christ's miraculous birth, for no one would believe this who had not first known Christ as his Redeemer. But those who knew Him in this character, and then learned what previously was a holy mystery, afterwards spoke of it, and what they had first known of Christ attested to them the truth of the wondrous fact. So shall we, on our part, also hold to it, and not begin to let go our faith with facts whose meaning is only understood after we have come into contact with Christ's redeeming power and person. But, standing in this relation to the fact testified in Scripture and confessed in the Creed, we all the more energetically repudiate the futile grounds with which it is sought to overturn that fact.

"Would that every one saw clearly, and indeed on both sides, that essential questions are here at stake, which cannot be decided by mere historical means. I will put the matter as strongly as possible, that the meaning of my words may be placed beyond doubt. Only one who sees in Christ the highest miracle of the world's history, because he knows his own faith, regeneration, and conversion to be a miracle which cannot be explained by the factors of the natural system of things; only one who sees within this natural world a higher spiritual world-history, which the natural one subserves, will without offence accept in faith the miraculous facts of the life of Christ, because he knows it to be homogeneous with the spiritual world, in which he lives We will not so far deceive ourselves as to think that by giving up the points now first contested, 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,' unity would be restored for long; for we believe in Jesus Christ, God's only-begotten, incarnate Son, in a different sense from our opponents, and will not allow the latter to conceal the difference reaching to the roots of our faith with words of the same sound. When we call Christ our Lord, we mean it in a different sense from those who pass by His resurrection, His ascension, and sitting at the right hand of God, with a shrug of the shoulders and a shake of the head. Let us be honest on both sides, and say to ourselves, that here there is no longer any question of faith in Christ in the sense of the Church, and therefore of faith in the Father and in the Holy Ghost in the sense of the Church; not because, as has been erroneously or ignorantly said, the clauses in question are the foundation or cornerstone of Christianity, but because the denial of them brings out clearly the fact, that the faith remaining in the incarnate Son of God is different altogether from the confession we make about Him along with the entire Christian Church."

Dr. Frank points out also how the Apostles' Creed, testifying as it does to the great facts of redemption apart from doctrine, is still the common meeting-ground of all Churches, Roman and Protestant. This does not bind us to receive all the old interpretation of the articles; but growth in understanding does not affect the essential substance of the Creed. The case of the *Descensus* and *Communio Sanctorum*

is the same as that of the doctrine of the Son of God. "Shall I give up my more definite belief, such as the further development of the Church has produced, because the interpretation in ancient days was indefinite, perhaps subordinationist? Or should I be content with confessing the only-begotten Son of God, as Ritschl and his friends do, without asking what they mean by it? The Church has the right and the duty to spare and preserve the first childlike, yea childish, beginnings of faith in the immature—destroy it not, for a blessing is in it—but it has no right to yield to and unite with those who unscripturally oppose accepted doctrine, and, in order to conceal their contradiction, treat us to generalities."

"I repeat once more: it is untrue that only particular parts of the Creed, which your criticism finds to be unhistorical, offend you; the quintessence of the confession, faith in the incarnate, only-begotten Son of God, you do not share with the Church, the Evangelical Church, and hence comes, in the last resort, your opposition, hence the applause of the undiscerning crowd which delights you. I should wish that fact at least to be clearly understood by the authors and leaders of this movement, and show them the value of the praise lavished on them. . . . It is well that the thoughts of men should be revealed; for, amid the indescribable ambiguities which at present are so conspicuous in theology, we need clearness. It will be seen who still adheres to the faith of the Church, the Evangelical Church."

CURRENT FRENCH THOUGHT.

THE CHRIST OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS. By J. BOVON (*Revue Chrétienne*).—The Gospels of the New Testament are not the only writings with that title that have come down to us from Christian antiquity. In the ages immediately following the time of the Apostles, there was a luxuriant growth of apocryphal literature of very unequal value, which was never admitted by the Church as having the authority of the sacred writings, but which enjoyed a certain measure of popularity in Christian circles. Some of these documents were regarded from the first with suspicion, because of the heretical character of their contents, and have almost entirely disappeared. The only traces of them are in brief quotations to be found here and there in the writings of the early fathers. But others, which were less offensive to Christian orthodoxy, have come down to our own time. The principal of these are: *The Protevangelium of James*, in Greek, attributed to James, the brother of the Lord—which Justin Martyr appears to have known; *The Gospel of Thomas*, of a somewhat later date, but quoted by Origen; *The Gospel of the Pseudo-Matthew*, belonging probably to the third century; *The History of Joseph the Carpenter*, of Coptic origin, and belonging to the fourth century; *The Arabic Gospel of the Infancy*, now only known to us in the Arabic (with a Latin translation), but probably originally written in Syriac, from which the stories of Christ in the Koran are borrowed; and what was formerly called *The Gospel of Nicodemus*, but is now regarded as a combination of two distinct works, (a) *The Acts of Pilate* (perhaps of the second century), and (b) *The Descent of Christ into Hell*, a work belonging to a somewhat later period.

Sometimes these apocryphal texts reproduce and amplify narratives in the canonical Gospels, but more frequently they profess to give information concerning events which the sacred writings do not record—circumstances connected with the nativity and early life of Jesus, and His sojourn in the world of spirits after His death and before

His resurrection. From the historical point of view, they are utterly worthless; no new facts can be gleaned from them. They are often coarse and vulgar in tone, and the miracles recorded in them are mere prodigies, devoid of moral or spiritual dignity. Nevertheless, these legends have exercised an influence on the ideas and practices of the Church, which we can trace down almost to the period of the Reformation. The apocryphal narratives have supplied the Roman Catholic calendar with the names of a good many saints, they have given rise to the festival of The Assumption of the Virgin, and have insinuated themselves into certain parts of the ancient Roman liturgy. Nor is their influence upon mediæval Christian art less noticeable; they have furnished some of the most favourite subjects for pictures, and suggested details in the treatment of them. Thus the scene of the Saviour's nativity is usually represented as a cave, in spite of the history in St. Luke's Gospel. Joseph, whom tradition transforms into a priest, is depicted as an old man, wearing a mitre and holding a green branch in his hand. Some old pictures represent the Virgin, in accordance with the legendary history, as surrounded on her death-bed by the twelve Apostles, whom God had miraculously brought together for the purpose from all parts of the world. We may say that in all cases where the Biblical text and the apocryphal writings are at variance, the popular mind preferred the latter, and that the influence of this spurious literature upon the ideas of the people during the Middle Ages was far stronger than that of the sober and chaste narratives of the New Testament. This is not to be set down to caprice or ignorance; it rather proves that both the authors of these legends and their admirers had similar views of the work and person of Jesus Christ.

Now, however incoherent they seem to be, the apocryphal narratives are pervaded by one idea. They are all tainted by *docetism*, as it is called in theological language: that is, the authors of them do not realize, or they even deny, the true humanity of the Saviour. In reality the Jesus of these legends is human only in appearance, and it cannot be said of Him that He has been made like us in all things except sin. Development is the law of our nature; but the Jesus of the Apocrypha, so far from progressing, is what He will be to all eternity. As a child, He possesses the Divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence. "Do not consider Me to be a little child," He says to Mary on the journey into Egypt, "for I am, and always have been, perfect; and all the beasts of the forest must needs bow down before Me" (Pseudo-Matt. xviii.).

It would be easy to show that this docetism, though condemned as a theory, has always prevailed in the Church; and, no doubt, this fact explains the great favour shown towards these apocryphal histories. Man, being unable of himself to realize the Divine life, tends to become isolated from God; but as if, on the other hand, he could not do without his Creator, he seeks on all sides for means for filling up the void. Hence results the tendency discernible even in the development of doctrine within the Church: in proportion as Christ the Son of God was conceived of as infinitely exalted above humanity, it became the more necessary to think of there being mediators between us and Him. Such was the tendency of Roman Catholicism during the Middle Ages; the popular belief represented Jesus as an inaccessible being, whose vengeance was feared, and before whom men must tremble.

We can scarcely fail to see a certain relation between these ideas and the conception of Christ's person and character which the apocryphal Gospels disclose. So natural indeed seems the need for averting the attention from the humanity of the Saviour, that even the Protestant Churches of our own time can scarcely be said to be free from the error involved in this procedure—they do not fully realize he

representation of Jesus which is given in the Gospels, "who learned obedience by the things which He suffered," and who was "tempted in all points like as we are." Modern theology endeavours to get rid of this docetism by freeing itself from the metaphysical formulas borrowed from ancient Greek philosophy, which still weigh so heavily upon Christian thought. Dogmas, moulded and coloured by Platonic philosophy, represent Jesus as a Divine being, merely veiled by a human form, and devoid of individuality; but the exegesis of our time brings before us the living Christ of the Gospels in the unity of His life, God because He is man, and because man was created in the image of God. We must therefore make our choice between two rival conceptions. Those who believe in a Christ who had an intuitive knowledge of all the mysteries of the universe should logically take the side of the apocryphal Gospels as against the canonical; for, according to the latter, Jesus learned what He knew in the ordinary way, and never concealed His ignorance even of matters relating to the future of the kingdom of God (Luke ii. 40, 52; Mark xiii. 32). And let no one imagine that, by the suppression of the human element, the Divinity of the Saviour succeeds the better in receiving the glory due to it. The history of dogmas show us that that Divinity, when isolated from a true humanity, becomes warped, and loses its august character of holiness and love.

THE PLACE OF APOLOGETICS IN PROTESTANT THEOLOGY. By D. H. MEYER (*Revue de Théologie*).—The study of apologetics should evidently come after those which relate to the sources of Christianity and its historical development. The books of the New Testament show us what primitive Christianity was. Biblical criticism answers impartially questions connected with the age, authorship, and authenticity of those documents; while exegesis interprets their contents. The common aim of both Biblical criticism and exegesis being to go back beyond the opinions of theologians and the dogmas of Churches to the Christianity of Christ and His first disciples, these studies naturally take their place at the beginning of Christian theology. Then comes historical theology, which traces the course of Christianity in the world—Church history; and the development of Christian thought—the history of dogmas. The special work of apologetics is to show that this positive and historical religion, the origin and past of which Biblical criticism, exegesis, and Church history concern themselves with, is the true religion—that Christianity can claim by a unique title to be of Divine origin. Apologetics, therefore, come, in the order of the theological sciences, after historical and before dogmatic theology. Before founding on the Bible the edifice of dogmatic teaching, it is necessary that the authority of the Bible itself should have been settled on a firm foundation. It is on apologetics that the duty rests of laying that foundation.

The first principle that should guide apologetics is one that is too often forgotten; it is that Christianity, if it is true, being necessary for all, the demonstration of its truth ought to be of a kind that all can understand. No doubt apologetics will at times address itself to a special class. All branches of human knowledge—science, history, and philosophy—bring in their turn their tribute of objections and arguments; and to this department will evidently fall the duty of addressing each in turn—of becoming all things to all men in order to convince some. Nevertheless, apologetics should, as far as its main lines of proof are concerned, avoid discussions for understanding which a special education is needed. In other words, it should avoid critical and historical discussions, since these are only open to a limited number, while the demonstration of the truth of Christianity should be of a kind that all can follow.

A second principle of apologetics should be that Christianity, if it is true, being

necessary for all, all have need of being certain of its truth. The Roman Catholic finds this certainty in the authority of the Church and of an infallible Pope, its organ and head; but for us Protestants there is another way open by which to reach the result. We arrive at this certainty of belief by a careful study of the four documents which profess to inform us concerning the Founder of the Christian religion and concerning His teaching. If there exist decisive reasons for believing the truth of the Christian religion, it is there that we may expect to find them; if Christianity is true, if it is of Divine origin, it is in the teaching of its Founder that we shall find a firm basis for certainty in the matter. We see from a study of the historical documents on which Christianity rests, and of its history for eighteen centuries, that the first disciples, and after them the Church, recognized in the religion founded by Jesus Christ the character and dignity of a religion of Divine and supernatural origin. Were they right or wrong? The answer to this question depends on the idea we form of the person of the Founder of Christianity. The Apostles and the first disciples believed and affirmed, the Christian Church for eighteen hundred years has believed and affirmed, that Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Man, notwithstanding the fact of His having been our Fellow and Brother, was more than a mere man—that He was indeed the only-begotten Son of God. Is this conviction well-based, or is it illusory? Who is Jesus Christ? It is for the apologist to set forth the teaching and declarations of the four Gospels; for they are calculated to convince honest and unprejudiced minds that Christ really was, as His Apostles unanimously believed and proclaimed Him to be, a unique, a holy, and Divine Being.

The point of connection between the human soul and the teaching of Christ is to be found in conscience. In each one of us conscience testifies to the obligatory character and to the inviolability of the law of righteousness. And the moral teaching of Jesus Christ approves itself to the conscience: it confirms its testimony, and is seen to be the perfect revelation of the law of righteousness.

From this the apologist will pass on to the fact that in the four documents which have preserved His words for us Christ speaks of Himself as one—as the only one—who has perfectly observed the law of righteousness which He revealed. He never acknowledges sin, or His own need of pardon. This perfect holiness of Jesus is attested by the unanimous evidence of those who witnessed His life—by His Apostles and all His first disciples. It is impossible that there should have been a misunderstanding in a matter of such importance on the part of men who learned from Jesus the unity, the spirituality, and the absolute authority of the law of righteousness, and who proclaimed the guilt and the universality of sin. It is still more impossible that the Son of Man Himself, who knew the human heart so well, could have been ignorant of His own, or that He had all through His life a false and unjust opinion of His own moral condition—that unconscious of His sinfulness, He, like the hypocrites He upbraided, should have passed His life in beholding the mote in the eyes of His brethren without considering the beam that was in His own. If there is one thing certain upon earth, it is the historical reality of the perfect holiness of Jesus Christ, attested as it is by Jesus Christ Himself.

But not only was He conscious of having here below realized a perfect holiness, but He attributed to His own person an absolute religious value, resulting from a unique relation between Himself and God. Now, it is manifest that the Son of Man, who was perfectly holy, and whose holiness sprang from His relation with God, could not be deceived as to the true nature and character of that relation. He whom the last of the prophets hailed beforehand as the Sun of Righteousness did not mislead His disciples, or deceive Himself when He declared that He was the only Son of God.

The apologist will lay stress upon the unity of the testimony of Jesus Christ concerning Himself in the four Gospels. This testimony is consistent throughout. The perfect holiness of Jesus is ever connected with His filial relation to God. The testimony of the Christ of the synoptic Gospels, and that of the Christ of the fourth Gospel, are at one in this. And with the truthfulness of Christ's testimony concerning His Divinity is involved that of His testimony concerning those Divine works which, as He says, the Father gave Him the power of accomplishing—those works which occupy so prominent a place in all the Gospels, which are bound up with His teaching, and which reveal both the love of the Son of Man and the omnipotence of the Son of God. And in the great fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ the apologist will show the seal set by God Himself to the testimony of Him who asserted that He was the Son of God, and who was manifested as such in His life, and teaching, and works. The miracles of Jesus Christ, and His resurrection from the dead, are a necessary part of apologetic proof. Thanks to that direct and supernatural intervention of God Himself, the Christian reaches absolute certainty in his belief in Christianity. It is on this immovable rock that assurance of the truth of the Gospel and of its Divine origin is based. Hence it is that we believe what He taught concerning the care of the heavenly Father for all His children, concerning the kingdom of God which Jesus founded, concerning the Holy Spirit promised to all those that ask for Him, and concerning the righteousness accomplished by means of the sacrifice of Him who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Since Jesus Christ was the Son of God, the Bible, of which He is the centre, has a right to that controlling authority in matters of faith which believers ascribe to it when they call it the "Word of God." In declaring that He came to fulfil the law and the prophets, the Son of God attests the Divine origin and authority of the preparatory revelation of the Old Testament. And, as for the books of the New Testament, they are and will ever remain the written Gospel—the revelation of the Son of God; they transmit to us His life and words, and, in a sense, His historical personality; they are the faithful and permanent echo of the teaching of the Apostles whom He Himself chose and instructed, whom He appointed to carry on His work, and to whom He promised the assistance of the Spirit of truth.

CURRENT DUTCH THOUGHT.

NOTE ON THE LAMENTATIONS. By PROF. A. KUENEN.—Dr. Joh. Dyserineck, the translator of the Psalms and Proverbs, has published in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (1892, No. 4) a revised translation into Dutch of the Lamentations, accompanied by critical notes on the Hebrew and Septuagint texts and a brief introduction. Dr. Dyserineck is of opinion that this book was written subsequent to the year 586 B.C., but he reserves the publication of the results of his investigations on this point for a future opportunity. In the meantime, he prints "a few fragmentary observations" made by the late Prof. Kuenen in a letter to his friend Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, who had consulted him as to certain difficulties in the way of assigning the composition of the Lamentations to about the year 586. As Kuenen had not at the time of his death been able to take up the study of this book for the revised edition of

his *Historico-Critical Inquiry*, the observations here referred to possess some interest, and they are accordingly reproduced in full.

"The alphabetical form of poems of about the year 586 B.C. has always been to me a puzzle. But there is nothing to alter the fact that *most* of the Lamentations must really be of this period. Even Reuss, among others, admits this, however much *he*, by his dating of the Psalms, must be inclined, *à priori*, to place them later—very much later. In particular, the mention of the king and the prophets is decisive.

"In the fixing of this date I am *not* hindered by the difficulty which you urge, that after the repeated captivities there was no one left in Judæa from whom such poems could have come. We may very well assume that those who were not carried away were very numerous, and that many of them stood relatively high. I do not go so far as Oort, who makes those who remained behind play a very important part—as well in northern Israel as, later, in Judah. But when I reflect that besides Jerusalem there were still so many considerable towns, I dare not look upon the catastrophe which principally overtook the capital as an annihilation of the whole people. Is not Ezekiel xxxiii. 23 *et seq.*—written *ab irato*—a speaking testimony that after 586 there was much that occupied both the heads and the hearts of the people? (I would rather not call to aid the hypothesis that some of the Lamentations were written in Egypt. It is, I think, extremely improbable.)

"But now as to the relation between chap. iii. and the other four. I am inclined to agree with Stade that chap. iii. is considerably later. This is proved chiefly by the contents, but also by its somewhat artificial form. Steinthal in his *Bibel und Religionsphilosophie*, pp. 16-23, is not in error when he sets the highest value upon chap. iii. from the religious point of view. But I cannot agree with him when he regards it as equally as old, vigorous, and matter of fact as chaps. i., ii., and iv. The pious thoughts and reflections appear to me to be very slightly personal—to some extent rather conventional. This would thus lead me to set down the poem as post-Exilic. You think, however, that vers. 48 and 51 upset this view. But is it so? Chap. iii. is, indeed, written in the name of *the community*, perhaps even (cf. v. 1) placed in the mouth of Jeremiah. In this case are the expressions there used too strong? I believe they are not.

"There still remains the idiom of chaps. i., ii., iv., and v. I do not deny that there are points of resemblance between it and that of the Psalms. The words mentioned by you which occur here and there, may, as you correctly remark, be increased by many more. But, so far as I can see, there are no decidedly later words among them, so that they may very well have belonged to the language of poetry even before the period at which most of the Psalms were written. And if this may be admitted as possible, I hold it to be actually the case on the ground of the varying impressions which chaps. i., ii., iv., and v. give on the one side, and the Psalms on the other. It is in the more concrete contents, but not in them alone, that the Lamentations appear to be much better constructed, and more solid—if I may use the expression—than by far the greater part of the Psalms. In the few Psalms which I would except there probably lurk older portions which were not wholly covered over or wiped out at their adaptation for the Temple service. It is possible that continued study of the idiom would compel me to sacrifice this æsthetic judgment; but I do not think so.

"That is all I have to say on the question at present. *Si quid novisti rectius istis, candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum.*"

THE CHRISTIAN HOPE. By Dr. J. G. BOEKENOOGEN (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1892, No. 6).—Men of old faced the mysteries of the grave with greater confidence because they had the conviction that Jesus had risen and thus had triumphed over death. It is quite unnecessary to criticize the New Testament traditions regarding a resurrection from the grave and an ascension into heaven of Jesus; but it may be remarked that the orthodox are needlessly alarmed at the effect of this criticism upon their faith. And, after all, what effect would such events of the bygone past have now, even if they were firmly established? The fact that the Son of God left the tomb and showed Himself stronger than death by no means guarantees the same power to sinful mortals like us. To orthodox believers the actual value of belief in the resurrection of Jesus lies in the assurance that where He is there they also shall one day be. Their proof for that is the mystical feeling of their fellowship with Him. In fact, the significance which the death and subsequent return to life of Christ have for them is that they are the symbols of the death and return to life of all who, through faith, have become one with Him, and thus through God's grace are partakers of all that is His.

Men have sought to demonstrate personal immortality by means of three kinds of evidences—the analogical, the metaphysical, and the teleological. Analogy can yield no actual proof, but only a ground of probability. Appeal has been made to the development of the plant from the grain of seed, of the bird from the egg, of the butterfly from the caterpillar, in order to create the feeling that a dead person may also live again in another and better form. This argument is not so weak as it seems, and it has been considerably strengthened by recent discoveries in the domain of nature. Men are convinced that in nature neither matter nor force is lost; but analogies like these are altogether unsatisfactory, even as grounds of probability in favour of personal immortality. While they loudly testify to the universality and eternity of mind, they fail to decide between these two possibilities: either a number of units, *each by itself* of unlimited duration; or a number of units, each by itself of limited duration, but of unlimited duration *as a whole*. Guided by the arguments which analogy suggests, we are forced to conclude that the abiding value of the human mind appears to consist in the perpetual springing up of a common consciousness rather than in the continued existence of the same consciousness in one person.

From the metaphysical argument not merely a ground of probability, but certainty should be expected. In the metaphysical conception of substance are of necessity included the properties of individuality, unchangeableness, and eternity. If it is possible to apply these to the human soul, then its immortality will be proved. The idea of substance is generally assumed as a postulate of thought. In examining things we cannot stop short at what is fixed and temporal, but must necessarily believe that there lies under each phenomenon something enduring as a continuing basis. This is assumed by natural science; hence one of its fundamental principles. Experiments teach that a certain quantity of matter after having passed through all sorts of combinations, and having in its progress exhibited very varying properties, can always in the end be brought back to its original condition. In the same way one might seek to prove the permanence of mind; but, after all, the unchangeableness and eternity of material atoms are no more proved by the metaphysical argument than is the immortality of the soul.

The teleological arguments, with which may be grouped the ethical and theological, do not bring us any further. Our moral life indeed postulates an idea of God in which holiness forms the chief characteristic. Because the less cannot be more than the greater, therefore the moral being cannot be better than the divinity

from whom, to whom, and through whom are all things. From this it follows that man can reckon with certainty upon the attainment of his destiny. From the love of God it is not to be supposed that He would allow man to hope in vain for the highest good; nor, from His righteousness, is it to be thought that evil will not be atoned for to the uttermost, and that good will not be crowned with blessing. But it is not proved that for the fulfilling of these good things personal immortality is indispensable; and so long as this is not raised above doubt the argument loses its force.

But having regard to all the possibilities of the case, it is going too far assert that the inevitable end of all earthly human society must lead to the conclusion that moral effort in its behalf is vain. On the contrary, many a one is sure to find reason enough for the existence of a moral being in the fact that he may form part of a consistent series of phenomena which have occupied thousands of ages—yea, that he represents a highly important element therein, and will have the right and the power to fill great periods of the history of the world with events which satisfy his needs, his desires, his ideals. If, over and above that, it is recognized as an inviolable demand of religious belief that the world does not exist for the purpose of being serviceable to us personally, but that we and it together may be serviceable in promoting the honour of a Divine Majesty, then it will be possible to admit that a humanity which shall one day come to an end—after it has displayed the highest virtue and has tasted the highest good—may have accomplished God's design, and may have reached its destiny. And so many an earnest thinking and feeling man will be able to obtain a satisfying view of the world and of life, apart altogether from belief in a personal immortality.

After carefully weighing the arguments which are adduced in favour of the continued individual existence of man after death, a sentence of *non liquet* must be pronounced. However much personal immortality may claim to be regarded as by no means impossible, still it is not in the least degree proved, and many will look upon it as improbable. Some may, perhaps, complain that this is a dubious conclusion to come to regarding a belief which relates to man's own future, and thus touches him more closely than any other. Are not the foundations of human life thereby undermined? On the contrary, in the possession of the Christian faith we remain on firm ground. We require that faith as the basis of our action and of our hope; but, at the same time, there must be nothing loose or uncertain that ought to be firm and sure. We may say, like the Apostle, "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Rom. xiv. 8). We have to learn to regard the common life of humanity, conceived as a kingdom of God, as an eternal city, as life with Jesus. In like manner, continued personal existence cannot be understood otherwise than as a permanent fellowship with Jesus. We find our allotted place by attaching ourselves to the moral order of the world and to its Head, by applying to our life the standard set up for us by the great Teacher of righteousness and Guide to truth. All that comes to human life of more than temporal significance we meet with in the highest measure in Jesus. Fellowship with Jesus is fellowship with all the Divine and supersensual principles that can and must be realized in man individually and as a member of humanity. The relation in which the life of man stands to what is elevated above human narrowness, to what is absolute and eternal, is indicated by the moral fellowship which has unfolded itself historically and bears the name of Jesus Christ. We see in Jesus how life springs out of death. He exercises an imperishable influence for good. The death of this Leader is bound up with the

spiritual strength and enthusiasm of His followers in such a way that it appears as if the last stand upon the shoulders of the first, and in this manner steadily rise higher till the most exalted point is reached. Humanity is, as it were, spiritually born; at least, its spiritual life is made plain to it as a peculiar and abiding force. The unity of its religious and moral leanings and aspirations became evident when it believed in and attached itself to the Firstborn from the dead—the ever-loving Jesus. True, perfect life is life with Jesus.

Possibly some may not be able to agree with the idea that Jesus Himself was not conscious of, neither knew nor felt, the blessing which He imparted. Perhaps some are only satisfied with the thought that He, as a personal power, actually knows, and draws, and leads His own. Let it be so. But still, although this may not be believed, nevertheless it cannot be denied that faith in Jesus is the true animating power, and that Jesus is the resurrection and the life. Faith in Jesus is such a power because it is *faith*, and consequently not an intellectual conviction, but along with that a moral determination of the will. He who wills something does not merely wait for his opportunity, but seeks to work it out by his own aid. Such a one hopes with a hope that maketh not ashamed, because he is filled with love and enthusiasm. He seizes what opportunities present themselves, endures misfortune with patience, nor yet doubts, although the favourable circumstance is slow to arrive. It will do so in good time. He forms for himself an ideal, and although it is not realized, he rejoices all the same, as did Moses, who was permitted to view the promised land. He saw it in its length and breadth, glorious and fruitful. He saw it unsullied by the enormity of Israel's idolatry and the shedding of the innocent blood of the prophets. And so he who believes in Jesus sees what is enduring before him, while he dedicates his life to the service of God, lets his will walk in the ways of the Eternal, and exerts his powers for the highest good.

More than that, the Christian faith teaches endurance of what is uncertain in the future. This faith leads up to the disposition of mind in which a man is content to rest satisfied with the possibility that his personal existence may have its limits in the short space of time that lies between the cradle and the grave—a period that is sometimes filled with so much sorrow, and which, looked at by itself, is always far from perfect. This faith sets before us the claims of self-denial; and as we, looking to the end of our personality, must be all the more in earnest in the exercise of this virtue, what else can place us in a position to do so than just this faith, than the closest possible adhesion to the pattern of perfect self-sacrifice? This faith calls love the great commandment. When, then, is the Gospel better fulfilled than when the love with which we smooth the way through life to those who remain behind us becomes the highest means possible within our reach of leading to spiritual perfection? This faith testifies that suffering for others is the greatest favour that can be shown to them. It is the means by which they may be sanctified. It impresses upon our heart the feeling that all are one body and one spirit. Who, then, that has the spirit of the Gospel in himself will lament if self-seeking results in disappointment, and if happiness as well as misery are only present for a time? Is not this the fulfilling of the Gospel? And so we are assuredly free to declare that Jesus has done no less for us than He did for our forefathers. He makes the way to the grave easy, and annihilates the terrors of death. Although for us His resurrection is not as it was for them a fact, nevertheless it is the manner in which an imperishable truth is proclaimed—He is our life.

DID JESUS LOOK UPON HIMSELF AS THE MESSIAH? By Dr. J. A. BRUINS
(*Bibliotheek van Moderne Theologie en Letterkunde*, 19^{de} dl., 1^o st.).—Did Jesus

look upon Himself as the Messiah? That is the question I propose to discuss; but is it a question at all? For the majority of Christians, certainly not. I mean those who may be designated as supranaturalists, no matter what ecclesiastical colours they may wear, or what type of dogma they may represent. For them Jesus is not only the Christ, the Son of the living God, but He has proclaimed Himself as such in the most unequivocal manner. For them, therefore, the question now put is not an open one.

But may not this also be the case with many Broad Churchmen? Certainly they are not disposed to leave Jesus attired in the Jewish royal mantle which He has so long worn. No; Jesus never was, and never wished to be, a Jewish Messiah. All that is found in the Gospels regarding the Son of David, who shall come to set up the kingdom of His powerful forefathers, or regarding the Son of Man, who comes in the clouds of heaven, surrounded with angels—all that cannot stand the light of historical criticism. But although it is not doubtful that the ideal of a purely national Messiah had no charm for Jesus, although it is certain that He least of all saw that ideal realized in Himself, it is altogether another matter whether Jesus did not look upon that ideal as His own, when rid of its national and sensual elements. May He not, so to say, have cherished a spiritual Messianic expectation? May He not have seen such an expectation fulfilled in Himself, if not at the time of His first appearance, at any rate progressively, more and more, until at last He became convinced of it? If I mistake not, many are inclined to answer this question in the affirmative. According to my conviction, we are called upon to deal seriously with an open question, and with a very important one. It is, in truth, one which affects our conception of the origin and essence of primitive Christianity. I will try to make a contribution to its solution, but nothing more than a contribution. I trust, however, that what I advance will be sufficient to indicate the lines along which the definitive solution of the problem must be sought.

Did Jesus look upon Himself as the Messiah? If a satisfactory answer to this question is to be found, it will be well to begin by asking the so-called preliminary question, Were the ideas of Jesus regarding the kingdom of God of such a nature as to show that He really believed in a Messiah? If they were not, then the main question falls to be answered in the negative. Some may think that this preliminary question may be cleared out of the way at once by the observation that whoever names the kingdom of God names also the Messiah, so that the belief of Jesus in the kingdom of God involves belief in the Messiah. But this would be treating the matter too lightly. If at one time among ourselves idealism was spoken of without an ideal, so among the Jews Messianic expectations may have been spoken of without a Messiah. At any rate, Messianic expectations may be talked of in which the Messiah forms so small an integral part that but a step has to be taken and he vanishes altogether. As a rule, I think we attach too much importance to the idea that the spiritual life of the Jews was dominated by the idea of a Messiah. To be sure, there was a time when belief in the Messiah formed the central point of Israel's future expectations. These were the days of the royalist school of prophets, of the first Isaiah and Micah, of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. They were the heralds of the Son of David. But among the younger prophets—the second Isaiah, Haggai, and Malachi—one may search in vain for the Messiah. Having regard to this fact, it may be safely asserted that after the Captivity the expectation of a personal Messiah gradually died out. The old royal race had become too unimportant to be able to believe in its glorious future. Not that the expectation of a kingdom of God had been abandoned, but that a kingdom of God was looked for instead of a Messianic kingdom. At a later period

this state of affairs remained unchanged. The post-Christian Jewish literature proves that the expectation of a personal Messiah in the days of Jesus was not at all generally cherished, and that a conception of the kingdom of God was current in which at most an unimportant place was reserved for the Messiah.

It is thus seen that the preliminary question, Did Jesus believe in a personal Messiah? is by no means got rid of. How is it to be solved? We must ask, What did Jesus teach concerning the kingdom of God? But how difficult it is to answer this question decisively! Not to speak of other difficulties, the great drawback is that in the Synoptic Gospels we meet with different, and we may add with irreconcilable, representations of the kingdom of God. Which of these shall we ascribe to Jesus? It is necessary to be certain on that point, so with that object in view, let us glance at the varying conceptions of the kingdom of God that are to be found in the Synoptics.

First of all, we have to mention a picture of the kingdom of God in which it is portrayed as the result of a slow and gradual development, as the fruit of a principle working in humanity. This picture is met with in the parables of Matthew xiii. (with the exception of verses 24-30). In particular, the parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven are noteworthy. There is here no mention of a catastrophe, of a sudden, vehement transition from the *αἰὼν ὅστος* into the *αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων*. But what part has a Messiah to fulfil in such a gradually coming kingdom? That would be difficult to determine, particularly when it is borne in mind that the Messiah is not only the bearer of a religious, but also of a political ideal. In the parables of Matthew xiii., nevertheless, there is no trace to be found of a national or political future expectation. It cannot be doubted that they have a universal application. The parable of the Fish Net, that brings all sorts of fish together, shows plainly enough that more than the future of the Jewish people is here thought of. What, then, becomes of the Messiah, who is indeed "the King of the Jews"? A similar representation of the kingdom of God lies at the basis of the well-known expression in Luke xvii. 20: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation"—*μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*—comes not like something which one sits and watches, or even sees coming. It thus cannot be said, "Lo here! or lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you." The ideas expressed in these words correspond with those of the parables of the Leaven and the Mustard Seed.

But it is not everywhere that we meet with this purely ethical conception of the kingdom of God. When we read, at the close of Matthew xvi., "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels" (and so on), we are miles away from the spiritual sphere in which the greater part of Matthew xiii. is placed. Here we have the kingdom of God as a purely Jewish eschatological expectation, and with these colours this kingdom is in several other places depicted. Only to mention two, I would refer to the so-called *parousia* discourses of Matthew xxiv. and xxv. In my opinion, these two passages have been erroneously termed *parousia* discourses. By *parousia* is now understood the second presence of Christ upon earth; in other words, His return. I think there is no allusion whatever to the second coming of the Messiah in Matthew xxiv. 31-46. We have here a Jewish picture of the coming of the *αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων*, which is adopted by Jewish Christians, and applied to Jesus of Nazareth. Every one feels at once that the kingdom of the *parousia* discourses is different from that of Matthew xiii. Here there is a gradual development, there a sudden catastrophe; here a reform from within, there a revolution in the opposite direction; here mankind, there Israel; here no place for a Messiah, there the Messiah, not only indispensable, but forming the centre

of the expectation so distinctively that He alone is named, and there is no mention at all of the kingdom of God; here no *παράρρησις*, no sitting on the watch, there quite an anxious outlook for the terrible phenomena which will herald the Messiah. But enough has been said to show that we have to do here with an entirely different representation of the kingdom of God.

But let us now fix our attention on representations of the kingdom of God to be met with in the Gospels in which the kingdom coincides with the *parousia*; in other words, the kingdom of God shall have come when the Christ (that is, Jesus of Nazareth) returns to earth. In this connection we have to consider the two parables in Matthew xxv., the Talents and the Wise and Foolish Virgins. Here we have left the soil of the national Jewish Messianic expectation. Eschatology we have, but Christian eschatology—much less sensual than that of the so-called *parousia* discourses; but yet what a difference there is between the parables of Matthew xiii. and those of Matthew xxv. Not to mention other points of difference, the Christ for whom neither place nor work is found in the kingdom of God, according to chapter xiii., is quite indispensable in that of chapter xxv. It is not merely that He comes with the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of God does not come without Him, and it depends upon Him who shall enter and who shall be shut out from the kingdom.

Alongside these three varying representations of the kingdom of God, we have in the Gospels two others which differ in nature and essence from them. In the first place, there is the parable of the Husbandmen in Matthew xxi. 33-41. In imagination, we have here exactly what is given in Romans ix.-xi., in the form of a dogmatical, philosophical demonstration, namely, the justification of the setting aside of the Jews and the preaching of the Gospel to the heathen. In Matthew xiii. the kingdom of God is, and remains, an ethico-religious ideal. In Matthew xxi., on the contrary, it is given historically; and if an ideal may still in that case be spoken of, then it is in this sense that the historically given kingdom of God is, the longer the more, accepted by both Jew and heathen. The same view is found in several other parables, such as that of the labourers in the vineyard who were hired at different hours, but received the same reward. These all exhibit the same type of kingdom, a type essentially different from the three we have already considered.

Lastly, there is a representation of the kingdom of God which differs entirely from those already mentioned. It is met with in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, in Luke xvi. Hitherto the kingdom, in its varying forms, has been sought for on this earth, now it is transposed to another world. It is in this way that the historical development of doctrines has taken place. A kingdom of God upon earth was clung to so long as the expectation of the return of Christ could be maintained; and when that ceased the heavens were opened for blessed believers. The expectation of a kingdom of God upon earth, although abandoned practically, was nevertheless kept up in theory, and continued to live in the form of a prospective millennium. We have thus, in Luke xvi., to deal with the metamorphosis of the early Christian *parousia* expectation. The kingdom of the heavens had become a heavenly state of bliss, which, at most, had only the name in common with the state of bliss that floated as an ideal before the eyes of the earliest believers.

We are thus able to distinguish five different representations of the kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels. The question now is: Which of these representations may we ascribe to Jesus? The question is, in fact, already answered, for the parables of Luke xvi. and others give a representation of the kingdom which cannot have been His, inasmuch as they presuppose conditions—such as the evangelization of the heathen world—which are posterior to the time of Jesus. Neither can the parables

of Matthew xxv., nor the ideas and representations contained in them, be laid to the account of Jesus. There remains the question whether in the so-called *parousia* discourses we possess the ideas of Jesus on the kingdom of God. In this case the period to which these parables belong, apart from all other considerations, is sufficient to decide the question. It appears to me that those discourses cannot be older than the second quarter of the second century. In these fantastically depicted Messianic expectations we certainly have not the ideas of Jesus on the kingdom of God.

Do we possess them, then, in the parables of Matthew xiii., that of the Tares and Wheat excepted? I am inclined to think we do for the following reasons: Matthew xiii. belongs to the so-called "logia of the Lord," of which Papias, in Eusebius, makes mention—the document containing the discourses of Jesus which anterior to our first Gospel constituted one of the sources from which our Matthew is compiled. It is thus a fact that tradition has always ascribed the parables of Matthew xiii. to Jesus, a testimony which does not apply to the other parables and discourses referred to, none of which belong to the "logia." But the Sermon on the Mount comes from the same source, and in it there is no trace of national particularism or of sensual eschatology. Now, if we find in Matthew xiii. pictures of the kingdom of God in which we recognize traces of the kingdom as sketched in the Sermon on the Mount, I think that we are right in associating with the name of Jesus the expectation of the kingdom as depicted in this chapter. We would come to the same conclusion if we compared Matthew xiii. with Matthew xviii., which is likewise reckoned as belonging to the "logia."

But if we possess in Matthew xiii. the ideas of Jesus on the kingdom of God, then I venture to assert that Jesus had no thought of a Messiah. What would the office of a Messiah be in a kingdom that should be the result of a gradual development, the fruit of moral and religious reformation in man and in humanity? I assume that Jesus cherished Messianic expectations without a Messiah, and thus that He did not regard Himself as such.

Let it be so, some may say, but what of the phrase "son of man" that was so often on the lips of Jesus? May it not be that He thereby indicates, let us say, a more human Messiah than that of the Jewish theocracy? This brings us to the question, What does the expression "Son of man" signify in the Synoptics? The expression occurs in them, excluding some passages that are certainly spurious, sixty-nine times; or, if the parallel passages are not counted twice, thirty-eight times. In most of these passages, it must be admitted, that the expression is a Messianic title; but it is tolerably certain that the expression "Son of man" as a Messianic title was not current in the time of Jesus, but first came into use at a later period among Jews and Christians. That being so, by far the greatest number of the passages in which the expression occurs cannot, in their present form at any rate, be attributed to Jesus.

And so the use of the title "Son of man" cannot, in our judgment, prevent us from ascribing to Jesus a representation of the kingdom of God without a Messiah. As regards myself, I have no hesitation in answering in the negative the main question, Did Jesus look upon Himself as the Messiah? Whether what is convincing to myself is the same to others I cannot tell. In any case, I trust that what I have advanced is sufficient to show that the question here put is indeed an open question, which we must try to solve if we would comprehend the origin of Christianity.

REGENERATION AND BAPTISM. By Rev. J. J. WESTERBEEK VAN EERTEN (*Tijdschrift voor Gereformeerde Theologie*, Jan., 1898).—When a person undertakes nowadays to speak of the connection between Regeneration and Baptism he

enjoys the important privilege of dealing with a subject that is of actual interest. The days have passed away in which Baptism was looked upon as a dry and wearisome subject of discussion. And yet the time is not so very remote in which it was no uncommon occurrence for preachers to devote but a single discourse to such a topic as the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. Apparently many a preacher found the Sacrament of Baptism embarrassing. There was not seldom a want of clear and just ideas regarding it; and instead of seeking for these in the writings of the fathers who flourished in the palmy days of the Calvinistic Churches, preachers confined their utterances to mere generalities. But happily these days are almost over. The interest in the covenant sealing of grace is again awakened. Now that the lines have been once more pointed out, according to Calvinistic principles, and that the covenant doctrine, after long neglect, is again looked upon as a precious possession, a listening ear is to be found for the truth so ably and clearly confessed by our fathers. True, we are not yet where we ought to be. The covenant doctrine still meets with opposition in many circles, most of all in places where either Methodism or Mysticism prevails. But still, a turning-point has been reached. Many are beginning to admit the possibility of their having to give up their own feelings in the matter of the significance of the covenant, and of exchanging them for what is taught in accordance with the Word of God by Calvinists.

Yet not long ago Dr. Kuyper called to mind that at present "Baptism is generally conceived of as being administered in hope of subsequent regeneration, whereas Calvinists have always taught that baptism should be administered on the presumption that regeneration has preceded."¹ That this peculiar conception has prevailed for many years, and is even yet tolerated by many, does not require to be insisted upon. But it cannot be too frequently emphasized that the sacrament is hereby slighted, and the sealing of grace is wholly misunderstood. If the sacrament is dissociated from grace; if it is supposed that there is no spiritual life present in the person baptized; then holy baptism is degraded to a human institution, to which power and lustre and significance must be given by word and speech. No; if baptism is to be understood in its Calvinistic sense, then the confession of the Calvinistic Churches touching this point must not be weakened. There is no question of giving and taking here; there is but one alternative. Whoever wishes to adhere to the Calvinistic Confession must adopt the hypothesis that whosoever is baptized is regenerated; otherwise, he must cease to sail under the Calvinistic flag. There is no escape from this. Suppose—what naturally cannot happen—that, in the case of a child presented for baptism, it could be made out that it was not regenerated, and *eo ipso* did not belong to Christ, then the ecclesiastical authority that would nevertheless permit the baptism of such a child would act contrary to the express teaching of the Calvinistic Churches.

In Article xxxiv. of the Belgic Confession we read, "Therefore, He (Christ) has commanded all those who are His to be baptized." It is thus expressly laid down here that only what belongs to the Lord may be furnished with His mark and badge. We may and must baptize, but always in the supposition that those whom we baptize are entitled to bear the Lord's ensign. That this doctrine was confessed by our fathers in the brightest days of the Calvinistic Churches has of late been frequently called to mind, but it may once more be specifically declared. It was, in fact, the early feeling of these Churches, and is found to have been expressly formulated even before the first convention was held at Wezel in 1568. In the Formulary of Holy Baptism of the year 1566, which was used by the Dutch Church at

¹ *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 1891, p. 338.

London, expressions occur which show that the Calvinistic Churches at that time already confessed that baptism is an effectual sealing of regeneration, and that the child presented for baptism is a believing seed, which therefore must be baptized. That the phrase "sanctified in Christ," touching little children, in the baptismal formulary of the Calvinistic Churches, must also be conceived of in this sense, is abundantly clear to the careful reader of this formulary. How can the Church join with sincerity in the prayer that baptized children may grow and increase in Christ if they are not believed to be in Him? And in what other way can these little children be regarded as being in Christ except that they, by a sincere faith, are ingrafted into Him? And that ingrafting, that possession of the power of faith, what is it other than partaking of regeneration?

That the Calvinistic Churches of Holland have spoken out on this subject without circumlocution is made perfectly clear by the Canons of Dordt; and other testimonies to the same effect are by no means scarce. Junius, who died of the plague as Professor at Leyden in 1602, is a prominent witness of this. He lays it down that the receiving of Christ in the sacrament must necessarily be preceded by faith. For, says he, it is necessary that faith, or at any rate the seed of faith, should precede, since what is not of faith is sin. Yea, so necessary is faith that the Sacrament without faith condemns, just as the Word without faith kills.¹ Walaeus, a pupil of Junius, also a Professor at Leyden, and one of the translators of the New Testament into Dutch, authorized by the Synod of Dordt, expresses himself in similar terms touching the connection between regeneration and baptism.² It is thus indisputable that these theologians at any rate did not hesitate to speak with force and emphasis on this matter: an excellent proof that in those days men did not grope about in a fog, but, taking their stand firmly on the ground of God's Word and the covenant doctrine, clearly expounded the connection between regeneration and baptism.

THE BOOK CRITIC.

APOLOGETICS; OR CHRISTIANITY DEFENSIVELY STATED. By ALEX. B. BRUCE, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. International Theological Library Series. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.)

WHATEVER comes from the pen of Prof. A. B. Bruce is nothing if not fresh and human. Prof. Bruce has a dread of conventionalism amounting almost to a horror; a distrust of dogma, which leads him to give it a wide berth in his expositions of Christianity; a devotion to the Divine Man of Galilee surpassing that of most. It hardly needed the Preface to this valuable new work, accordingly, to assure us that its apologetic does not follow the old traditional lines. It might safely have been predicted that its defence of Christianity would proceed on a fresh and original method, would bear the impress of its author's characteristic way of looking at Christian facts, and would be in living touch with the thought and needs of the time. This is really the character of Prof. Bruce's new volume. It is a book penetrated from beginning to end with the influence of the modern spirit. It is the work of one who is in fullest contact with all the currents of sceptical opinion and

¹ *Theses Theologicae*, xlix. : *De sacramentis in genere*.

² *Synopsis prioris theologiae. Disputatio xlv., de sacramento baptismi*.

speculation of the age, and has deeply felt their impress on his own spirit; who has personally wrestled with the doubts which he describes, and has found the stay of his faith in the historic Christ. It is this which makes it so peculiarly timely and valuable as a contribution to the literature of Apologetics. One may desiderate, and think that the evidence justifies, a firmer tone on certain subjects than Prof. Bruce, from his apologetic point of view, has seen fit to adopt. One may doubt the wisdom of occasional lines of argument. But there can be no question of the fresh and forceful character of the book as a whole; of the positive character of most of its conclusions; and of its utility in clearing the air of secondary issues, and in directing attention to the points of really vital moment in the present condition of the conflict with unbelief.

The work of the apologist for Christianity at the present time is a difficult and complex one, though perhaps not more so, relatively, than at some previous periods (see Dr. Bruce's section on Celsus, pp. 9-16). Not only is he confronted with massive and compact systems, professing to be the legitimate outcome of modern thought, which involve in principle the subversion of the Christian claim; not only is the atmosphere charged with a multitude of new and revolutionary conceptions, like that of evolution, with which he must in some way come to an understanding; but within the Church itself novel theories are being propounded, and opinion is in a state of marked transition on the whole manner of conceiving of the Bible, of revelation, of the growth of Christian doctrine, of the relation of doctrine, even as found in the Apostolic Epistles, to the primary Christian facts, above all, on the mode of conceiving of the course of development of the religion and literature of Israel. All this creates new problems which the apologist must face, and on which it is certain beforehand that his pronouncements will be subjected to rigorous, and not always friendly, scrutiny. Prof. Bruce shapes his apologetic in view of these various needs. His first book (preceded by a brief historical sketch, and by some remarks on the function and method of apologetics) is devoted to "Theories of the Universe" which stand in antagonism to the presuppositions of the Christian view—Pantheism, Materialism, Deism, Modern Speculative Theism, Agnosticism. The second book deals with "The Historical Preparation for Christianity"—in other words, with the Old Testament religion and the relation of apologetics to recent critical theories. The third book is an apologetic study of "The Christian Origins." The work is written in clear, admirable, genial English, with an enviable flowingness and purity of style. It is impossible here to go into detail over the wide field of discussion which it opens up; only a few points can be touched on which may indicate the author's general position.

The first book—that which deals with "Theories of the Universe" (pp. 47-163)—needs little comment. The criticism of the opposing theories is prefaced by two chapters on "The Christian Facts" and "The Christian Theory of the Universe," in which the outlines are sketched of "the characteristic ways" in which Christianity regards "God, man, and the world, and their relations" (p. 48). This, with the discussion of systems which follows, is a highly valuable part of Prof. Bruce's work, and will be felt by many to be strengthening and suggestive. However it may be with the author on other points, his tone is firm enough and uncompromising enough in dealing with these unchristian theories. On the whole, Prof. Bruce does not think highly of the theistic "proofs." Flint and Martineau "have at least tried well, whatever may be thought of their success" (p. 154). His chief reason is the absence of agreement among theists themselves as to the value of the various proofs, their depreciation of one another's arguments, &c. But is this conclusive? Does not precisely the same

thing happen in apologetics? How many of Prof. Bruce's own arguments will command unquestioning, or even general assent, on the part of those who in some form profess Christianity? Another point on which we cherish grave doubt is whether the evolutionist account of the origin and primitive condition of man is as compatible with the Christian doctrine of sin—accepting his own admirable sketch of it—as he apparently supposes (pp. 61-63). If man began only a step removed from the brutes, it is difficult to see how sin—if sin in that case it can be called—is anything but a necessity of nature.

The second book of Prof. Bruce's work is that to which many readers at the present time will turn with peculiar interest. In it he enters with great fulness into the nature and development of the Old Testament religion. On all the points involved he states his views with frank and fearless honesty. His chapter on "The Religion of the Prophets" is an excellent general sketch of "their conception of God and of His relations to the world, to the nations, to Israel, and to man." He does full justice to the originality and grandeur of this prophetic conception.

"It is admittedly a unique phenomenon in the religious history of the human race, rising above all other ancient thoughts of Deity in solitary grandeur. Whence came it, how is it to be accounted for? This is a question not easy to answer on naturalistic principles. . . . The prophets themselves had no doubt as to whence their knowledge of God came. It was, they felt, a revelation from heaven" (pp. 190, 191).

From this point Prof. Bruce goes on to discuss "The Prophetic Idea of Israel's Vocation and History," "Mosaism," "Prophetism" (now as a stage in the progress of revelation), "Prophetic Optimism," "Judaism," "The Night of Legalism," "The Old Testament Literature," and "The Defects of the Old Testament Religion." Here, also, only a point or two can be referred to. Prof. Bruce has naturally a good deal to say on the relation of apologetics to the results of recent criticism. On this subject, while arguing that "the apologist must necessarily be that of one who refuses to be deeply committed on critical questions" (pp. 172, 173), he allows his own position on the main issues to be seen with tolerable clearness. Thus, on the one side, he distinctly severs himself from the naturalistic school in recognizing the Divine election of Israel, and in tracing back the monotheism of the prophetic teaching to Moses.

"It is a violation of all historical probability to minimize the significance of Mosaism in deference to a naturalistic theory of evolution, which demands that the early stage in a religious development shall be sufficiently rudimentary to allow the whole subsequent course of things to present the appearance of a steady, onward progress" (p. 209).

He specially vindicates the decalogue for Moses as the "grand, outstanding, imperishable monument" of the man and his prophetic work (p. 209). On the other side, he seems to regard it as settled that the Levitical law did not originate with Moses, but was a post-exilic product. "The last eight chapters of Ezekiel's book of prophecy appear to be the first sketch of a Levitical system" (p. 264). One cannot but suspect that Prof. Bruce's mind is not quite free from bias on this subject—so strong is his dislike of ritual, and so great his desire to show that Moses, as "prophet," could not have had anything to do with matters of this kind (pp. 218-20). One great objection to the modern view of the Old Testament is the difficulty felt in working it out without involving oneself in the hypothesis of pious fraud. It cannot be said—at least we do not feel—that Prof. Bruce's remarks on this head are altogether satisfactory.

"It is arguing in the same spirit," he says, "to say that God could not inspire, or employ as His agents, men capable of what we might now feel tempted to call a *pia fraud*. It

is a sample of the mischievous apriorism which it is so difficult to get rid of in connection with this class of questions. . . . God may inspire men who commit what we deem literary sins, say we, for books of the Bible in which these so-called literary sins are committed bear all the marks of inspiration—the divine in us bearing witness to the divine in them" (p. 310).

We agree much more cordially with a remark of Prof. Bruce's on a previous page:—

"Nothing is more remarkable in the prophetic character than an exquisite sensitiveness to everything savouring of insincerity. It revealed itself in the abhorrence, justly commented on, of all religion divorced from right conduct. It showed itself equally in a careful avoidance of whatever approached untruthfulness in religious language," &c. (p. 236).

The difficulties created by recent criticism are acknowledged, and time and patience are needed to clear them up; but the improbabilities are far from being all on one side, and many who cannot rid themselves of the impression that this favourite theory of the post-exilic origin of the law, and of so much else in the Old Testament, is an elaborate attempt to make things stand on their heads, will not feel that in the line he has adopted on these topics Prof. Bruce's apologetic is at its strongest or best. He himself, however, speaks most hopefully of the gain likely to accrue even to "the unlearned" man from the critical treatment of the Bible.

"The plain man can get some good from the Bible, enough to save his soul, without the aid of the critics; but not all the good that is possible. . . . It is now the turn of the critics to do their best for the people. This is the task of the future" (p. 308).

We doubt if the plain man will appreciate the advantage.

The result of prophetism was to give birth to three ideals—"A right Royal Man, a kingdom of the good with God's law written on their heart, and a suffering Servant of God, making Himself King of that kingdom by His spiritual insight and self-sacrifice" (p. 358); and it is now shown in the third book how, after the obscuration of these ideals in "The Night of Legalism," they were historically fulfilled in Jesus Christ. Here we reach ground on which Prof. Bruce is thoroughly at home, and never fails to interest and charm. First we have a chapter on "Jesus," for—

"If Jesus was the *Christ*, Christ was also *Jesus*, a man who lived in Palestine at a certain date, of very unique moral and religious character, and very welcome for His own sake, apart altogether from His relation to the previous history of the world in general, or of Israel in particular" (p. 337).

Then follows the consideration of Jesus as Christ, Jesus as Founder of the Kingdom of God, Jesus Risen, and Jesus as Lord. The chapter on "Jesus Risen" is a careful and successful examination of the various theories of Christ's Resurrection, with the aim of establishing the reality of the physical resurrection. We may quote the remark on Keim's "telegram theory":—

"Christ sends a series of telegrams from heaven to let His disciples know that all is well. But what does the telegram say in every case? Not merely my Spirit lives with God and cares for you; but, My body is risen from the grave. That was the meaning they put on the telegrams, and could not help putting. . . . If the resurrection be an unreality, if the body that was nailed to the tree never came forth from the tomb, why send messages that were certain to produce an opposite impression! Why induce the Apostles, and through them the whole Christian Church, to believe a lie?" (p. 393).

The subsequent chapter on "Paul," gives just prominence to the supernatural factor in Paul's conversion, while endeavouring, and rightly, to trace a psychological preparation for the great change in the Apostle's earlier experience. "All attempts at explaining Paul's conversion without recognizing the hand of God in it must be

futile" (p. 418). The treatment of "Primitive Christianity" opposes Baur and Weiss, and goes largely on the lines of the mediating view of Weizsäcker.

An interesting question which underlies the whole book, but which comes necessarily more into prominence in the later sections, is, What is the Christianity which it is proposed to defend? There is peculiar danger of doing Prof. Bruce injustice here, for we are not sure that in some respects he does not do injustice to himself. As sources for our knowledge of Christ and Christianity, he lays the principal, almost the exclusive, stress on the Synoptic Gospels. He defends, indeed, the genuineness (or possible genuineness) of the Fourth Gospel, but gives it a quite secondary place in comparison with the others. Christianity, then, for Prof. Bruce is, in the first instance, the Christianity involved in the sayings and doings of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels—particularly Christ's revelation of the Divine Fatherhood, of the sonship of men, and of God's grace to the sinful. That this is the basis of the whole may freely be admitted, but there are not wanting expressions as if Prof. Bruce would fain have the Church stop there, and were disposed to treat the further doctrinal determinations of the New Testament as mere theological developments of the first generation of believers—the result of subjective reflection on their part, to which we cannot ascribe normative value for the Church of to-day. A more careful examination of Prof. Bruce's statements will show that this is scarcely his meaning. Besides Christ's sayings and doings in His earthly ministry we have, by Prof. Bruce's own acknowledgment, as facts to be taken account of in Christianity, His death, resurrection, and exaltation to Divine Lordship, with all the light which these events throw back on His earthly course, and on His sayings as to the redemptive virtue of His death, and its connection with the forgiveness of sins (p. 382). In a wider regard we have seen Prof. Bruce recognizing that Christianity involves even "a theory of the universe." It is on the total of these facts that the Apostolic Gospel is based, and it is a question which the Church will soon have to face more earnestly than it has yet done, whether that Gospel is to be treated as only human deduction from these facts, or whether, as the Apostles themselves affirmed, it was the product of the Spirit of revelation, infallibly guiding them into the understanding of their meaning. If revelation is to be admitted in the prophets, why should it not be acknowledged in the Apostles? In any case the question has to be answered, Is the Apostolic doctrine of Christ's person and work true? For if it is, we plainly cannot now decline to take account of it in reading the records of Christ's human life in the Gospels. This is where we do not see how Prof. Bruce's theory can be carried out, that the believer ought to begin with the human side of Christ's character in the Synoptic Gospels, ignoring the teaching of the Epistles, and only gradually rise to the recognition of Christ's Divinity and atoning work as spiritual insight develops (pp. 337-42). We cannot retrace the steps of the first disciples as if we were exactly in the same position as they—as if nothing had happened in the interval. Christ has now not only lived, but has died, has risen again, has been exalted, has poured out His Spirit, has reigned for 1,800 years. Can all this be treated—even in the most elementary teaching about Christ—as non-existent? Is it not part of the Gospel regarding Him—truth we are bound to teach if we would guide men into the right understanding of His nature and claims? Prof. Bruce is unquestionably right—and it is his great merit to insist upon it—in saying that it is only through the historic manifestation of Christ that we can put real meaning into these terms about His Divinity and Messiahship. He does invaluable service in recalling the Church from dogmas to the living image of the Lord in the Gospels. But we shall not understand Christ better by separating the end from the beginning, and refusing the light which the one casts on the meaning of the other.

Let us take for a moment the great miracle of the Resurrection, which Prof. Bruce in his chapter on the subject has so ably vindicated. It is a first principle with Prof. Bruce—one again in which he is unquestionably right—that miracles are not to be viewed as mere external appendages to Christianity, but are to be regarded as integral and constitutive parts of it. This applies to the miracles of healing; but it applies, surely, not less, but more, to the great physical miracle of the Resurrection. Our view of Christianity, therefore, even on the basis of the Synoptic Gospels, must be one which takes in the Resurrection of Christ as a constitutive part of it. This already carries us beyond the Galilean ministry, and leads us to some such conception as that of the Pauline Gospel. Prof. Bruce fully acknowledges this (Bk. iii. chap. v.). What is not obvious is, how, distinctly recognizing it, he should yet think it possible or desirable to limit the initial knowledge of the believer to the period when as yet the Saviour's claims were not fully manifest.

There are a multitude of points of instruction and interest in this volume which the sympathetic reader cannot fail to profit by. The concluding chapter on "The Light of the World" sums up the results in a strain of noble faith.

"In the foregoing pages the authority of Christ has been exalted above that of all other claimants. . . . His teaching sums up and crowns the best thought of the wise in all ages and lands. It is throughout in affinity with reason. The just, wholesome authority of the Church depends on the measure in which Christ's Spirit dwells with her. 'The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.' Therefore, Christianity is the absolute religion. It is indeed God's final word to men. On the simple principle of the survival of the fittest, it is destined to perpetuity and to ultimate universality" (p. 514).

J. ORR, D.D.

WORDS OF COUNSEL TO ENGLISH CHURCHMEN ABROAD. Sermons by the Right Rev. C. W. SANDFORD, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. London: Macmillan. 1892.

THE title of this volume is only partly accurate. Some of the sermons which it contains were preached in England; and not a few of those which were preached out of England contain nothing that can be considered "counsel to English Churchmen abroad" in any special way. They might equally well have been addressed to any ordinary congregation at home. Not until p. 44 is reached, that is near the end of the fourth sermon, does one find anything which can be regarded as intended for those who "are travelling or sojourning in foreign countries." Among these general sermons, which might have been preached anywhere, one of the best is the second, "On the Church's Catholicity," which was written for the Dedication of the American Church of St. Paul in Rome, March 27th, 1876. Along with this should be read the discourse on "Why am I a Churchman?" preached at Cannes, February 29th, 1889. They are firm, clear, and sensible. Less satisfactory, from a practical point of view, is one on "Comprehension without Compromise," for it not only sets forth an ideal of Christian unity which is avowedly unattainable, but seems to disparage, if not condemn, the only conditions on which comprehension is possible, viz., the recognition of the fact that on some highly important subjects certainty is unattainable; and that, therefore, people "cannot be expected to take the same view of the truth," but "must agree to treat the expression of [their differences] with mutual forbearance" (p. 51). In the excellent advice which follows as to getting rid of bitter party spirit, he illustrates from the three main parties in the Church of England the familiar truth, that schools of thought are commonly right in what they affirm, wrong in what they deny; or, as the Bishop phrases it, each of them errs, "not so much in its positive, as in its negative and controversial side" (p. 53). Generally we find that it

is precisely this negative and controversial side about which argumentative Christians care most. Instead of making the very most of the nine tenths about which we agree with others, and the least that we conscientiously can of the one tenth about which we differ, we emphasize and exaggerate the one tenth, and all but ignore the nine.

More generally acceptable will be a very useful sermon on "Sobriety and Quietness—our Church's Chosen Way," but it contains one rather questionable piece of advice. "Whenever the emotions are greatly stirred, be very careful to act upon the impression, and to act at once." If this means no more than that emotion in religion must not be used as a spiritual luxury to be indulged in at pleasure, without leading to action, the advice is sound enough. But it might easily be taken to mean that impulses which come to us in times of strong religious excitement are always to be followed without calm deliberation afterwards. In this way people might easily be led to undertake, and even to vow, what was far beyond their moral or physical strength, such as a life of celibacy, the surrender of all earthly goods, work in a difficult mission-field, and the like. And there is little doubt that some of the many who have made shipwreck of their lives through overtaking their powers have been led to do this by acting at once upon impressions received when the emotions were greatly stirred.

One other small criticism may be allowed. The text for the sermon on "Living by Rule" (Eph. v. 15) might either have been left as it stands at the head of the discourse, or else have been corrected more thoroughly. "See then that ye walk circumspectly" (as in the Authorized Version) is the heading. And the Bishop leads off by saying that the original should be rendered, "See that ye walk strictly, exactly, precisely." But, first of all, we must get the original in its correct form, as near as may be; and we shall then have to transfer the adverb to the other verb, "Look therefore carefully how ye walk." This is not quite so apt a text for a discourse on living by rule, for it does not so much mean "See that ye walk according to a well-chosen method of life," as "Beware of the perils which surround you." Nevertheless, the sermon on the value of rules of conduct is a valuable one, whatever view one may take of the text.

Near the centre of the volume are a pair of sermons which are the complement one of another, and might well have been placed side by side. One on "The Spirituality of Worship" (pp. 101-108) is based on John iv. 24, and was appropriately preached at Nablus, the modern Shechem. The other on "The Presence of God in Holy Places" (pp. 134-141) was written for the Dedication of the Royal Memorial Church at Cannes, built in memory of Prince Leopold. The one shows in what sense it is true to say that all places are equally holy; while the other shows in what sense this is not true, and how natural and salutary it is to regard some places as more sacred than others.

But our space is exhausted; and, in conclusion, the volume, as a whole, is heartily commended to English Churchmen, both at home and abroad.

A. PLUMMER.

THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SCEPTICS: A CONVERSATIONAL GUIDE TO EVIDENTIAL WORK. By the Rev. A. J. HARRISON, B.D. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1892.

The volume is supplementary to the author's former one, *Problems of Christianity and Scepticism*, which it closely resembles in purpose, contents, and style. The principal change is the adoption of the form of dialogue, which is skilfully managed. Like the former volume, the present one has a note of very distinct originality.

There is, perhaps, no field in which original works are comparatively so few and non-original so abundant as apologetics. One is tired of weak reproductions of mighty arguments. To know the few masterpieces is to know all that is necessary. The author of the present volume, who has worked many years as lecturer on Christian Evidences ("Evidential Missioner of the Church Parochial Mission Society, and Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society"), and has come into contact with sceptics and scepticism of every kind, gives from the stores of his own experience abundant information about the chief objections to Christianity and the best ways of dealing with them. His book is full of first-hand knowledge. The necessarily miscellaneous topics are classified in four books of five chapters each, with two chapters of "personal experience." The latter element, however, pervades the entire work. The two works together throw a flood of light on a most interesting and yet practically unknown world—the unbelief of this country. It is evident that professed unbelief is much more superficial than is often thought. Sceptics are not always what they seem. Tertullian's saying about the soul being naturally Christian is true still. A few opinions in the volume surprise us. In more than one place the author expresses qualified approval of the annihilation theory. Again, "There is great need of an absolutely honest *Handbook of Christian Evidence*, written by a man who perfectly understands the laws of evidence, and is prepared to face fearlessly whatever results the impartial application of the scientific method, so far as it really applies, may produce." It also seems needless for the author to limit his audience as exclusively as he does to the ministers of his own communion. Others will benefit by his frank, honest, impartial arguments.

J. S. BANKS.

THE DISTINCTIVE MESSAGES OF THE OLD RELIGIONS. By the Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, D.D. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London.

FROM Dr. Matheson we always get something bright, stimulating, and suggestive. On every subject he takes up he has always something fresh to say, and he says it in a most pleasant and instructive way. We may not always agree with his conclusions, but whether we do or not, we feel that we have benefited greatly by his genial companionship, and have been stimulated by the bracing and generous atmosphere of his thought and life. He has discoursed on many subjects, and his discourse is always worth listening to. His present aim is to tell us what message the old religions have for us. What may we learn from the religions of China, India, Persia, Greece, and Rome? What message from the Teuton, from Egypt, from Judæa? And what relation is there between Christianity and the messages of the past? We shall permit himself to state his aim:—

"By the distinctive message of a religion, I mean not an enumeration of its various points, but a selection of the one point in which it differs from all others. My design is therefore more limited than that of some volumes of equal size. I do not seek the permanent elements in religion with the Bishop of Ripon, nor the unconscious Christianity of Paganism with F. D. Maurice, nor the moral ideal of the Nations with Miss Julia Wedgwood. I seek only to emphasize the dividing lines which constitute the boundary between each religion and all beside. In the concluding chapter I have tried to reunite these lines by finding a place for each in some part of the Christian Message" (Preface, p. vi.).

The task is an important one. Before we ask how far Dr. Matheson has succeeded, we shall look at the Introduction to his book. Here he deals with the important question of the origin and nature of religion.

We have read his Introduction with great care, and have gone back to its more important points more than once, and we have not been persuaded by him. I

truth, there is nothing so unsatisfactory in literature, or science, or philosophy as speculations regarding the mental state of the primitive man. Mr. Spencer frankly tells us that neither by induction nor by deduction can we hope to obtain any insight into the state of the primitive man, and he falls back on the theory of evolution. Dr. Tylor has also his presuppositions, and others eke out our scanty knowledge of facts by a good deal of theory. Nor is Dr. Matheson any exception to the rule. His primitive man is as wonderful as the primitive man of Mr. Spencer. A primitive man can, according to Dr. Matheson, act in the following way:—

"When the primitive man looks within himself, he becomes conscious of something of which he is not conscious when he looks at something outside of him: he becomes aware of a limit to existence. In casting back his individual memory he is almost immediately arrested by a blank. He can retrace his steps some forty, fifty, or sixty years, and then he is stopped by a stone wall. There is a point beyond which he cannot go, and at the back of which there is oblivion" (p. 4).

It is in this fact that Dr. Matheson finds that the primitive man first reaches the conception of a beginning, and "awakens for the first time to the conception of a cause in the universe." Let us see what, according to Dr. Matheson, the primitive man can do and cannot do. He is aware of a within and a without. He can look within himself, and can look without himself, and compare his consciousness of what is within with his consciousness of what is without. He can remember what has happened for forty years back, and can reflect that there was a time when he was not, and that "the existence of which he is now conscious has a distinct origin." All this implies a very complex and a very advanced consciousness, and it is difficult to imagine a being gaining his first experience "of a limit to existence" in this fashion. Has he not a limit to existence in the very fact that for him there is a distinction between "within and without"? Is it necessary for him to reflect on himself, on his origin, to carry back his thoughts in memory for fifty years in order to find a limit to existence? Is not the limit already given in the rudimentary fact of experience. Dr. Matheson seems to have invented a complex process in order to explain a fact of experience, a process which seems to assume the fact in order to make it possible.

Nor does the explanation which Dr. Matheson gives of the fact that men worship inanimate objects seem satisfactory. He assumes that man's earliest worship is that of inanimate objects. This is doubtful, at all events it is not proven. Apart from that, is Dr. Matheson's explanation sufficient?

"Remember the conclusion which he (the primitive man) has reached with reference to his own spiritual nature. He has found it to be a poor, perishable thing, a thing which yesterday had no existence, and which is dependent for its present life upon the agency of some other power. He comes to the sight of nature with a prejudice against himself."

Wonderful! This primitive being has been able to reflect on his own experience so deeply as to have a prejudice against himself, and this has been accomplished before he has a "sight of nature." He being himself a poor, perishable thing, finds in a stone something which "exhibits no fluctuation, and is subject to no structural change." And he falls down and worships it. We might ask Dr. Matheson how the primitive man came to have the notion of change, or of permanence? Can he have the one without the other? Does not the explanation assume all that it professes to explain? For before the primitive man can attribute permanence to the stone, or perishableness to himself, he must have already reached somehow the notion of permanence; and this is the matter to be explained.

It is curious that Dr. Matheson has not seen this, for the next stage of his

argument brings it to the point. "If we find," he says, "the first generation worshipping the piece of wood or stone, we find the second worshipping the spirit of their ancestors." He sums up a somewhat intricate argument as follows: "The test of immortality shall be no longer the power of an object to remain unchanged; it will be the power of an object to abide in the presence of changes; and his own individual life, which first manifested that power, shall receive his first association with the thought of everlasting being." He assures us that "when the primitive man has reached this stage he is no longer primitive," and we quite believe him. But at this stage he is quite as primitive as the man who comes "to the sight of nature with a prejudice against himself," or he who finds by reflecting on the memory of the past a "limit to existence." It is quite as easy and as reasonable to put one of these in the first place as the other, and the lesson is that we shall make no progress in the study of religion by drawing fancy pictures of the primitive man. Elsewhere in this volume Dr. Matheson says: "In the absence of historical annals, we are driven within ourselves to contemplate the order of human thought." In the absence of evidence regarding the primitive man, Dr. Matheson has been driven within himself to find out what the primitive man was, and the order of his development. It is interesting to watch the process and to mark the result. For here is a singularly fruitful and suggestive mind at work, to which fancies, imaginations, and thoughts come in crowds; a mind which can weave them into a gorgeous web which fascinates us with its artistic beauty. Alas! however, that the primitive man thus depicted is a psychological impossibility. Would that Dr. Matheson had criticized his own fancies.

He passes on to speak of Fetichism, of Heathenism, and of Monotheism; and near the end of the Introduction we are arrested by this sentence:—

"If to every race there has come a time when the worship of one God has supplanted the worship of many deities, it can only be because in the worship of these many deities there has existed from the beginning one common element, one underlying principle which has made them already a unity" (p. 35).

Is this to be taken as history? or as prophecy? or as philosophy? It cannot be history, for, as a matter of fact, in only three religions, Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism, has the worship of one God supplanted the worship of many gods. It may be a prophecy; but in that case criticism may be deferred. As to the philosophical principle, we are not sure that we understand what is meant. Does the existence of a common element or of an underlying principle ever make a unity? The discussion of this point would lead us too far afield. We shall, however, say that such a unity as is made by a common element is a mere abstraction, and has but little value. Has Dr. Matheson discovered a common element in all religions? The chapter devoted to this subject is most instructive and valuable; it is well reasoned and beautifully set forth. "The common element in all religions is the idea of incarnation: the belief in the identity of nature between man and the object of his worship. . . . All efforts at Divine communion are based upon the recognition that there is a common ground on which the human can meet with the Divine." Yet even in this admirable chapter there are things of which we are not sure. Is incarnation the right word or the true conception of the common ground between the human and the Divine? Man is made in the image of God, is an old and true saying; but can we say that the Incarnation of God is an equivalent expression? We doubt it, for it involves theological consequences of the graver sort, consequences which we shall not point out now. Again, when Dr. Matheson says, "When the disciple of Christ goes into India to conquer the disciples of Vishnu, he commonly begins by

proclaiming the doctrine of a new-made flesh. He has no need to proclaim that doctrine; it has been proclaimed already. It lies at the root not only of the disciple of Vishnu's creed, but of all creeds," we take leave to doubt. And when he says, "The difference between Christ and Vishnu lies not in their incarnation, but in their nature," we again demur. As Hegel has pointed out, the idea of incarnation loses all significance when any living thing may be regarded as an incarnation of the Divine. Besides, the assumption of humanity by Vishnu is in appearance only, and, in the story of Krishna for example, the human nature is really laid aside when Krishna, slain by a random shot of the hunter Jará, returns to the great being. While we regard this chapter as an admirable one, and while we agree with the main results, we cannot think that Dr. Matheson has hit on the right road or the right conception of the common element in all religions.

We have read with great and ever-increasing admiration his treatment of the separate religions. These studies are fresh, striking, and original. The study of the religions of China is delightful. If we were asked which of these studies we prefer, we would unhesitatingly say those on China, and on Rome, and on Persia. We have read studies on India and its religions, on Greece, and on Egypt which we prefer to those which are in this book. Sometimes, indeed, it has seemed to us that Dr. Matheson has been somewhat arbitrary in the selection of one characteristic of a religion as its distinctive peculiarity. But on this point there is room for an honest difference of opinion. On any view, Dr. Matheson has done great service; and his book will bring within the reach of every one a clear, well-written, and eloquent statement of some of the best results of the study of comparative religion. It is only fair that we should state this broadly and firmly, for there are a good many points on which we cannot accept his conclusions. But disagreement does not blind us to the great qualities of Dr. Matheson's workmanship.

JAMES IVERACH, D.D.

SERMONS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By S. R. DRIVER, D.D. Messrs. Methuen, London.

THIS remarkable volume of sermons may be taken as containing the mature opinion of Dr. Driver upon many topics of the highest interest to the student of Holy Scripture. It is not uncommonly asserted that if the teachers of what is called the Higher Criticism have been able to retain their belief in the great verities of the Catholic Faith, it is in spite of, and not in consequence of, their belief about the structure and growth of the Bible. And there are prophets going about who predict the downfall of true religion in this country, if the views of the specialists who are trying to teach us the history of the formation of the Old Testament canon are generally adopted. As to the measure of proof which these theories have received, there is considerable difference of opinion; and it is not within the province or the capacity of the reviewer to say how far the general conclusions of the analytic school of critics are to be regarded as final. But the bearing of these conclusions upon the traditional belief of Christendom is a matter that affects every one, and is a matter upon which every one is entitled at least to form a judgment for his own guidance. It may, therefore, be reassuring to some minds to find that Dr. Driver, whose name carries weight wherever exact scholarship and sober thinking are valued, holds strongly that "the Old Testament exhibits the development, by successive stages, of a grand redemptive purpose, and that the New Testament records its completion" (p. 142).

In a paper read before the Folkestone Church Congress, Dr. Driver had emphasized the permanent moral and devotional value of the Old Testament; but what men were much more curious to hear from him was what he thought about its

permanent theological or evidential value. In the volume before us this topic is discussed more than once. "When all deductions which exegetical and critical honesty demands have been made, it is impossible to overlook or deny the correspondence subsisting between the anticipations and ideals of Israel and their fulfilment in Christ" (p. 141). He holds, indeed, that "the predictive element in the prophets is not so great as, perhaps, is sometimes supposed" (p. 107); but he insists that there are "undoubted and remarkable examples of true predictions . . . predictions declaring the issue of a present political complication, or announcing beforehand a coming event, especially events having a bearing on the progress of the kingdom of God" (p. 109). And, again, "we perceive that distinct lines of prophecy and type converge upon Christ, and He fulfils them" (p. 142). These sentences sufficiently illustrate Dr. Driver's general position stated on p. 69: "In the Gospel the principles determining the history of Israel are unfolded and matured; it is upon this larger and firmer ground, and not by the fragile aid of doubtful or mistranslated texts that unity of the two Testaments is to be maintained."

Perhaps the most interesting sermon in the collection is one on "The Warrior from Edom," in which the historical setting of the text is expounded with a clearness and vigour that recalls the exordium of more than one sermon on the Old Testament by a preacher of a very different school—Dr. Liddon. No two preachers could be more unlike in other respects; but this Dr. Driver has in common with the great Canon of St. Paul's, that he has the power of bringing a historical situation vividly before the minds of his hearers. The text of this sermon (Isa. lxiii. 1) is not referred directly "to the passion or triumph of our blessed Lord; in the prophecy, the conqueror is destined not with his own blood, but with that of his victims, and his enemies are not spiritual foes, but the nations of the world." But yet the general truth unfolded in the whole passage, "that man's opposition cannot thwart God's saving purposes, that He will, if need be, carry them through unaided, is signally and wonderfully exemplified in the closing events of our Lord's life upon earth. The Warrior in the prophecy is a Divine One, just as the Victor in the New Testament is the God-Man" (p. 186).

Two sermons—the first and the eighth—discuss the bearing of modern science on the early chapters of Genesis, and the preacher pleads for a frank recognition on the one side and on the other of the different spheres of science and of religion. Science has only to do with phenomena; it does not seek to penetrate behind the veil, but if it is conscious of its own limitations, it does not venture to assert that there is nothing behind the veil to see. And on the other hand, religion must not attempt to gag science by appealing to crude literal interpretations of the early chapters of the Bible. There are discrepancies between the Biblical accounts of creation and the established results of modern astronomy and paleontology, discrepancies which it is puerile to minimize. Unless we hold that Holy Scripture was intended to teach science rather than religion, the evolution of species rather than man's way to God, we need not be perturbed by the existence of trifling contradictions such as these. In these sermons Dr. Driver is upon very well-worn ground, and though his discussion is ample and candid, there is little in this part of the book that will strike many readers as novel. We observe that the note on p. 24, giving references to the English versions of the Chaldean account of the creation, is repeated, apparently through inadvertence, on p. 170.

Sermon iv., on the "Growth of Belief in a Future State," is really an elaborate essay on its subject. A brief summary is given of the passages of the Book of Enoch which bear on this topic; and, what is less well known and more interesting, the doctrine

of a future as set forth in the Targums is fully illustrated by citations. This chapter is full of instruction on an obscure and difficult subject, and will well repay perusal.

We have left ourselves no space to speak of the masterly discourses on the Prophets of Israel, their moral ideals, their state policy, and their historical significance; but enough has probably been said to direct attention to one of the most important volumes on the Old Testament that has appeared for some time. For the problems touched here are not mere literary or historical problems, as are most of those treated in Dr. Driver's more elaborate treatise, the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*; but they are *religious* problems. The subjects, many of them, are subjects on which every religious man who thinks *must* have an opinion. Does the Old Testament really point forward to Christ? Is it nothing but a record of a wonderful national life, or is it the overture to the Hymn of Redemption? These are great questions, and they are questions with which the most serious interests are involved.

J. H. BERNARD, D.D.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PROPHETS: THE WARBURTONIAN LECTURES FOR 1886-1890. By A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co.

ENGLISH theological literature during the last ten years has been well endowed with works of high excellence in varied departments of the field of Hebrew prophecy. It is unnecessary to refer to the contributions on this subject by Profs. Robertson Smith, Cheyne, Driver, Davidson, and Adam Smith. And now another work on the same attractive theme furnishes a clear indication of the direction in which the main interest in the deeper study of the Old Testament at the present time is tending. This tendency is the result of several causes. Of these the most potent is the most subtle and least obvious. It consists in the fact that the Higher Criticism, having diminished the value of the Pentateuch and historical books of the Bible as an exact and methodical presentation of the actual order of Israel's national development, has at the same time raised the moral as well as historic importance of Israel's prophets as contributors to the growth of religion to a level never previously recognized. The unique position of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, as standing midway between the stages of Israel's development, represented by the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi.-xxiii.) and by Deuteronomy, has only been adequately realized during the last twenty years. This trio of prophets and the Deutero-Isaiah were the minds that wrought out the evolution of Israelite religion from a tribal to a universal faith in the terrible Sturm-und-Drang period of Western Asian politics.

Moreover, in the writings of the Hebrew prophets we discover elements of teaching which are not to be found stated with like explicitness anywhere else in the Bible. In this respect the *Prophetæ Posteriores* discharge a function which neither *Tôrâh*, *Hagiographa*, or even the New Testament can be said to fulfil in equal degree, and this constitutes their claim to be regarded as in some respects the most modern writings in Scripture. In the great age-long controversy between Riches and Poverty the Hebrew prophet spoke forth with no uncertain sound while the Hebrew priest was dumb, and the former exalted righteous conduct to a position which had hitherto been usurped by ritual. Through the teachings of the Hebrew prophet the character of Jehovah was distinctly set forth as constituted by the eternal ethical principles of justice, which exalted Him to a position of universality and permanence that far transcended that of all other deities that were worshipped in that stormy age.

The present work is in some respects disappointing. Neither on the side of

popular exposition, that brings the teachings of Hebrew prophecy into vivid relation with the burning questions of the hour, nor on the side of historical exposition, whereby the genesis and growth of ideas are adequately set forth and explained, can Prof. Kirkpatrick be said to have contributed much to our present knowledge. This may perhaps be due to the fact that this function has already been adequately discharged by Prof. Adam Smith's work on Isaiah on the one hand, and on the other by such treatises as Duhm's *Theologie der Propheten* and Robertson Smith's *Prophets of Israel*. Doubtless it is difficult to occupy the field once more with real advantage when so much has been written during recent years of excellent quality, both in this country and abroad. Nevertheless, on the critical questions of Joel, Micah, Obadiah, and Zechariah, to say nothing of the *vexata questiones* of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the last word has certainly not yet been said. On these there is ample room for a work of ripe scholarship that shall clearly set forth the best results that have yet been attained, and shall contribute some fresh light on at least some of the intricate questions of date and authorship.

In the Preface the author states that "the object of these lectures is to give some account of the work of the prophets in relation to their own times; to show, letting each of them as far possible speak for himself, the contribution made by each to the progress of revelation." Thus, in the very terms of the task which the writer sets himself, the problems of the Higher Criticism at once arise in the determination of the age to which the prophetic oracles are to be assigned as a necessary preliminary to the adequate interpretation of their contents. It is for this reason we regret that the critical and exegetical notes to the lectures have been reserved "for a more suitable resting-place elsewhere." The inevitable result is that the treatment of so large a subject as Hebrew prophetic literature in the compass of 580 short pages is somewhat meagre and superficial.

It is, however, the duty of the critic to keep in mind the limitations which the author has imposed upon himself as to space and treatment, as well as those which are determined at the outset by the conditions of the Warburtonian lectures themselves. The Introduction has favourably impressed us. We are thankful for the sobriety of judgment and clearness of vision that characterize the remarks upon the present attitude of thoughtful minds on the subject of miracle and prophetic fulfilment as evidences of religious truth, and on the rights of criticism. The following passages are illustrative :—

"For example, the prediction of a Josiah or a Cyrus by name centuries before they were born was at one time regarded as an irrefragable proof of the inspiration of the record. Such predictions would no doubt be a very remarkable proof that the prophets who delivered them were the agents of an omniscient being, if we could be sure that they were really predictions. But the Book of Kings did not take its present form till after the reign of Josiah, and the name of Josiah may easily have been an addition to the original narrative, while many arguments combine to prove that the later chapters of the Book of Isaiah were not written until the lifetime of Cyrus. But even when circumstantial predictions can be authenticated, they cannot be held to possess the importance that was once attached to them. Isolated predictions of this kind give us little information as to the character and purposes of God. They may serve to attract attention, and appeal to the temper of mind which seeks for a sign, but they will not satisfy the more thoughtful student. For him the contemplation of the wider characteristics of prophecy as a whole will furnish a more solid if less startling proof of its Divine origin" (p. 10).

To the devout students of Scripture, who view the recent developments of the Higher Criticism with serious alarm, we commend the seasonable counsel contained on page 22 :—

"A prejudice is sometimes raised against the conclusions of criticism by the allegation that it springs ultimately from a desire to deny the predictive character of prophecy. It is possible that this may have been a motive with some of its advocates. But it is not so with others. They do not start with any theory of the impossibility of prediction. For them—to take a concrete example—the question with regard to the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah is not whether Isaiah could have uttered the predictions they contain, but whether the historical situation presumed is that of Isaiah's lifetime, whether the style is such that these chapters can reasonably be supposed to have proceeded from the same pen as the acknowledged prophecies of Isaiah."

The space which is at our disposal is insufficient for the citation of an interesting passage on page 24, in which the method and conditions of literary composition are clearly set forth and illustrated. We shall content ourselves with one more quotation in which the historic relation of legislative Tōrah to Prophecy is expounded in a few well-chosen words:—

"While, on the one hand, the earliest prophets bear testimony to the antiquity of Jehovah's revelation of Himself to Israel, on the other hand they cannot be held to afford proof of the existence of the Pentateuch in its present form. They do not appeal to a written law as the recognized standard of conduct. The 'law' or 'instruction' of Jehovah of which they speak is the equivalent of His 'word.' It is oral, and not written. It deals with morality, not with ceremonial. No doubt a sacrificial system was in full operation. . . . But the whole drift of the teaching of the earlier prophets indicates that the law, both moral and ceremonial, was still in process of growth, and though portions both of the legal and historical elements of the Hexateuch probably already existed in writing, other portions were still preserved by oral tradition. In fact, we must think of 'the Law' and 'the Prophets' as concomitant rather than successive disciplines" (p. 28).

Probably, the most questionable portion of the whole book is to be found in Lectures ii. and iii., which deal with the prophets of the pre-Assyrian period. It is certainly a refreshing experience to find a Hebrew scholar who has the courage to vindicate an early pre-Exilian date for any portion of Old Testament literature. And when Prof. Kirkpatrick, in this last decade of the century, has the courage to charge a whole army of Old Testament scholars in his chivalrous attempt to place Joel, as well as Obadiah, in the latter half of the ninth century, we can only exclaim with the French general, *c'est magnifique!* But I am afraid we must also join the latter in adding, *mais ce n'est pas la guerre.* In the first place, does not the writer weaken his position by taking the prophecy of Obadiah as an entirety? For, it should be observed, that the argument from canonical order which the writer employs in the case of Joel does not apply here. Moreover, the skilful array of proofs for the priority of Obadiah to Jeremiah is acknowledged by Cornill himself, but only as it applies to the *Ur-Obadiah*. In the second place, the use of Joel as a buttress to the author's argument for the early date of Obadiah certainly lends no strength. Even Riehm, the devout and scholarly critic, who reflected the best conservatism twenty years ago, pronounces the date of authorship of Joel's prophecies "*sehr streitig.*" For they are confessedly utterly destitute of the usual features which distinguish a pre-Exilian oracle (references to religious syncretism, high places, social laxity, to the Northern Kingdom as an existing state, to Assyria as a hostile power, &c.). Lastly, their contents and style hardly point to the ninth century. It is true that the book presents no points of contact with the Priestercodex. On the other hand, it has several references to JE (comp. especially ii. 13 with Exod. xxxiv. 6), while the careful investigations of Holzinger¹ on the language of the prophet render the later date of composition at least more probable. But the evidence on this last

¹ *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1889, pp. 89-129.

need is far from decisive.¹ On the general question of authorship and date, see Prof. Davidson in *Expositor*, March, 1888, pp. 203, foll.

It is satisfactory to note that the work is well provided with all the best results of cuneiform research as embodied in the works of Sayce and Schrader. I regret, however, to see the Assyrian monarch of the eighth century still called Tiglath Pileser II. Unfortunately, when the first volume of Schrader's work in English dress was being printed (1884), the designation Tiglath Pileser III. had not become current, and, for the sake of consistency, the old designation was maintained throughout both volumes. The correct form is, however, given in the Additions and Corrections, vol. ii., p. xi.

On p. 174 foll. there is a useful exposition of the Old Testament idea of holiness. I believe that the author starts from the right point of view on this difficult and obscure subject. He makes the Hebrew word *primarily* an attribute of Deity which afterwards came to be attached to all objects and persons immediately related to Deity. "God is holy;—persons, places, and things set apart for His service are holy by virtue of that consecration" (p. 175). In this connection the quotation of CIS. i., p. 14, is apposite, though the inscription belongs to the fourth century. Whether the signification was originally "separation" I regard as doubtful. But this is not the place to discuss a subject to which I have already drawn attention in these pages.

There is a useful analysis of the prophecies of the Proto-Isaiah on pp. 196-200. The dates assigned to the Oracles in nearly every case appear to us to be sound. But we cannot concur in regarding Isaiah xii. as pre-Exilic (p. 198, footn. 1). The parallel in Exodus xv. hardly conducts us to such a conclusion. For that poem exhibits traces of late Exilic or post-Exilic influences.

The treatment of the prophecies of Micah lies along conservative lines. The writer sees no serious break between chapters iii. and iv., for, in his classification of contents, the second division of the Oracles consists of chapters iii.-v. Indeed, he states that his somewhat full analysis has been given "with the object of showing that the book is not that disconnected collection of fragments, or the patchwork that it is sometimes represented as being. . . . In all probability it consists of discourses delivered on different occasions and under different circumstances" (p. 227). But the concluding words of the author (p. 230), in reference to chapters vi., vii., betray the weakness of his position: "At the same time, I feel that the arguments in favour of a later date have considerable weight, and the possibility that it proceeds from a different author must be allowed."

I must pass rapidly over the treatment of the prophets of the Chaldean period. Respecting the discussion on p. 243 of the date of Nahum's prophecy, I entirely dissent from both argument and conclusion. I cannot understand how Canon Kirkpatrick can assert in the footnote "the later date 623 [as opposed to his own proposed date 640] seems to me inconsistent with the description of the power of Assyria as *still unimpaired*." Surely Nahum iii. 18, 19, points in precisely the opposite direction. Again, the language of i. 14, ii. 1 (Heb.), can only apply to Judah during the reformation-period of Josiah's reign. To assume ignorance on the part of the author is a lame device. Wellhausen's arguments (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* Heft. v. p. 159) in discussing the significance of Nahum iii. 8 foll. must be regarded as decisive in favour of a later rather than earlier date, when Assyria's power was crumbling and her "people had become women" (iii. 13). Steiner rightly argues that

¹ The influence of *נֶחֱם* can hardly have been felt earlier than 700 B.C.

the tremendous catastrophe of Thebes would still remain a vivid recollection even then (notwithstanding Schrader's and Wellhausen's objections).

The discussion of Zech. ix.-xiv., with their complex and often baffling problems, I regard as the best in the book. The author's suggestion that על בניך יון (ix. 13) is a later gloss of the Maccabæan age (p. 473) is partially on the right track. Stade admits that it is possible that we have here underlying older oracles which have been re-edited at the beginning of the third century B.C. I would suggest that יון is here a substitution for the earlier אשור. But to this difficult subject I hope to return on a later occasion. Suffice it to say that the drastic expedient of cancelling the phrase "against thy sons, O Greece" out of the text does not commend itself to my judgment, since the phrase יון בניך ציון remains too bald an expression and lacks its natural complement. The parallel, 2 Sam. xxiii. 18, cited by Canon Kirkpatrick (and by Hitzig before him) for its use of the Poel, contains a precisely similar complement. Moreover, Wellhausen's probable suggestion in his recent work (quoted above) that אבני קלע in the following verse is an evident corruption for . . . בני, in which the יון בני are again referred to, is another argument for retaining the clause in question.

Yet with all the limitations of this work there is much within its pages that affords us sincere pleasure. We heartily commend its devout spirit, its sobriety on matters of criticism—above all its acceptance of the best ascertained results of modern scholarship, notably in its treatment of Isa. xxiv.-xxvii., xl.-lxvi. (though here a few words upon the difficulties of the concluding chapters would have been desirable). And last, but not least, we heartily commend the thoughtful concluding chapter, which gathers up into a brief compass some of the most important aspects of Old Testament prophecy in reference to Christ as its ultimate fulfilment.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

SAINT PETER AND THE FIRST YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Abbé CONSTANT FOUARD. Translated from the second edition with the author's sanction by George F. X. Griffith. With an Introduction by Cardinal Gibbons. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892, pp. xxvi., 422, 8vo, \$2.

This book, the production of a Catholic who has written a Life of Christ which has passed through five editions in the French and three in the English, will add not a little to the fame of its author. Only one other work do we know which can compete with it in fulness of detail and breadth of research—the excellent book of Professor Fisher on “The Beginnings of Christianity.”

Abbé Fouard confines his attention to the period between the resurrection of our Lord and the death of Peter. He has taken the book of the Acts as the foundation, and has gathered from all sides rays and beams of light, focusing them upon the events related in Luke's narrative until the latter stands out in astonishing clearness and with great sharpness of outline. His citations cover nearly the whole range of literature. Josephus, Philo, the Sibylline Oracles, Cicero, Ovid, Suetonius, Tacitus, Strabo, Herodotus, Pliny, Lucian, Horace, Perseus, Lucan, Plutarch, Martial, Bossuet, Cornelius à Lapidé, Lightfoot, Renan, and our own Robinson are a mere corporal's guard from the host of writers of almost “every land and tongue” who, under the adept manipulation of our author, throw light on the early Church. Of course the whole body of patristic literature is laid under contribution, and even from the Talmud are drawn, time and again, confirmatory indications of the truth of Luke's story.

And yet the book is not a *potpourri* of disjointed quotations, a *mélange* of pointless references. The abbé has made such use of his authorities that even out of heathen darkness stray gleams are gathered to illumine the period between 30 and 67 A.D.

Probably nowhere, not even in the picturesque Renan or the graphic Schürer, is there to be found so vivid a portrayal of the environment of the Church in Jerusalem during the first decade of its existence as is given in the first two chapters of the volume before us; nor can we discover a livelier picture of the wonderful favor which met the Jews of the dispersion in many lands than is given in the third chapter. In these chapters the author has laid the foundation for the remaining portion of his book by showing how attractive to

many of the heathen were even the rigid requirements and the high standard of morality of the Jewish religion, and how Christianity was at first supposed to be merely a variety of Judaism with expanding prospects and realized hopes. The writer thus explains the paradox that while the Jews opposed Christianity by all the means that fanatical hatred could suggest, yet the Jewish ghettos fostered the religion of the Nazarene till it spread far beyond the limits of the Jewish quarter in every city.

The abbé brings into strong light the fact that the synagogue, not the temple, was the model of the Jewish Church. In the course of his study he devotes a chapter each to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. He holds firmly to an Aramaic original for the former, written about the year 40, and translated into Greek by Matthew himself (although others also translated from the Aramaic, naturally Matthew's translation survived the rest). His position regarding Mark's gospel is that it is independent, was written about 52, sets forth Peter's teaching, but that Peter “neither hindered nor encouraged” its composition. He is in full accord with his Church on the weight of tradition, and agrees very closely with Bishop Westcott regarding the “Oral Gospel.”

Of course, being a Romanist, Abbé Fouard holds firmly to the presence of Peter in Rome, and, while allowing for the Gospel's being carried to Rome by Roman Jews immediately after Pentecost, makes Peter the real founder of the Church in the metropolis. He regards it as an established fact that Peter went to Rome in the year 42, and was driven thence by the edict of Claudius in 52, returning to Jerusalem to the council held there in that year. The abbé attempts to prove Peter's presence in Rome, but his argument fails to convince. He has contributed nothing new to the discussion, and has not touched the argument of Lipsius in the “*Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*” for 1876. The chapter on “Saint Peter's Ministry in Rome” begins with the sentence: “The details of Saint Peter's ministry in Rome are almost entirely unknown.” Yet, although he says in the next sentence, “It is not part of our plan to construct a story out of supposititious events,” the picture drawn in that chapter is so charming and has such an air of verisimilitude that the reader is in great danger of forgetting that it is idealistic, not realistic.

Apropos of the heated discussion now in progress in Germany over the Apostles' Creed, it is worth while to note that the author's position is substantially that of Professor Harnack. He grasps the evangelical truth that “Revelation has its history and doctrine its development.” He

shows that while the Scriptures were held to be too sacred to be altered in the slightest degree, the formula of belief was not regarded as unchangeable. He places the composition of the *Fundament* of the creed in Rome about 67, not in Jerusalem in 42.

Naturally, many of our author's positions we cannot accept. Now and then his reasoning is ingeniously fallacious, as when, e.g., p. xi., he "calls in evidence . . . the pontifical catalogue" of "the close of the second century." We opened our eyes at this, never having heard of such a catalogue, and supposed we had "made a find." But a foot-note tells us that " . . . we are led to infer" that this pontifical catalogue of "the close of the second century," which, let us not forget, does not exist, contained so-and-so. That is, there is "called in evidence"—what? A fact? Not at all; merely an inference! Yet this inference is the basis of much reasoning.

But the blemishes of the work are so few and so small that we unhesitatingly recommend it for earnest study. Especially is it valuable for the devotional spirit with which it is pervaded. We wonder whether it would not be profitable for us Protestants to read more books by Romanists, and in that way become more devout, even though we were less critical.

GEORGE W. GILMORE.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SCEPTICS: A Conversational Guide to Evidential Work. By the Rev. ALEXANDER J. HARRISON, B.D., Evidential Missioner of the Church Parochial Mission Society, etc. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. xvi., 341, \$2.

Mr. Harrison has been lecturing on Christian evidences for twenty-three years. His audiences have been expected to have in them many unbelievers, representing many varieties and degrees of unbelief, who have had the right of putting questions to the lecturer for information or for argument. He has, also, had many a public debate with champions of unbelief. It has, therefore, been necessary for him to know his subject thoroughly, and the ground under it, the territory adjoining it, and the atmosphere around it, to answer at once, and with a fulness and clearness sufficient to satisfy the requirements of hearers often ignorant and prejudiced, and all questions arising from false or partial views, from misapprehension or misrepresentation. After such a preparation it is not surprising to find that, having chosen to put in print his method and some of his experiences, his book should prove to be exceptionally interesting and useful.

There is another reason, too, why Mr. Harrison is qualified to write helpfully on

this subject. In his early life he was himself under the cloud and misery of scepticism during a period of three years. Thus he learned, in the school of experience, what some of the difficulties of sceptics are; and the memory of those years of his own distress is strong in him to keep his patience and sympathy unflinching toward all perversities and mistakes of men weak in faith or wandering in unbelief. The *spirit* of the author appears, indeed, in the aim of the book; and what that aim is appears in the title, "The Church in Relation to Sceptics." To "sceptics," not "scepticism." And throughout the book it is always noticeable that he is dealing with persons rather than with opinions and propositions; his purpose is, not to win his case, but to win his antagonist; to answer objections is only a secondary matter—the first thing, "the thing to be kept steadily in view," is to "bring the objector to Christ."

How to do this is answered in the first part of the book and in two chapters of "personal experiences" at the end. The author makes his suggestions modestly, but they are eminently practical and wise. They have been carefully considered and fully tried. Of the second part of the book it may be noted that it will be more serviceable in England than here. It is an exhaustive discussion of the work of the "Secularists." No doubt, however, we have in this country enough of the "secularist" spirit; and the closely reasoned argument in which Mr. Harrison shows how false and empty "Secularism" is cannot but be instructive. His conclusion on this point is expressed in the following words: "We have seen that Secularism is simply atheism, that atheism is simply a negation, and that that negation is wholly unnecessary to our highest welfare in our present life. There are many ways in which it is hostile to that welfare; but I need not pursue that. It is enough to see that it has entirely failed to make good its objection to the governing presence of Theism in daily life. Secularism, however, touches one with such infinite sadness that I can but content myself with pointing out its hollowness without one added word of censure. Besides, insincerity and hardness in those who, truly or falsely, profess to believe in God give only too much excuse for those who turn wearily from the Church in hope of finding refuge in something else. Argument has, I hope, its use; but it is only the living witnesses for Christ who can deal practically with the problem of a godless life. In logic and in love, every Christian Theist ought to be a Christian saint. The measure in which we resemble Christ will always be the measure in which we disarm Secularism."

It is clearly seen by Mr. Harrison that if the sceptic is to be brought home to faith he must first be found. The wilderness in which he is lost is wide. It must be ascertained where he is; and, if possible, the sceptic himself must be made to see where he is, and how he came there; this first, if he is to have confidence in the guide and reasonable understanding of the path leading him to truth and safety.

The third division of the book is given up to tracing out and exposing some of the ways by which men are carried away into scepticism—*e.g.*, a demand is made that they shall accept the opinion of some man or some party—a mere opinion, nothing more—as of the essence of the Christian faith, and not yielding to the demand, they are called, or they think themselves to be, sceptics; or, again, the faith which they really have is better than that temporary or local form of Christianity which they are not ready to accept; or, still further, they may have been misled into supposing that the results of modern science, and, indeed, its principles, require unbelief in the Christian religion. To many readers this and the remaining division will be the most interesting portions of the book. They bring under review such subjects as the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, the Immutability of Natural Law, Miracles and Answers to Prayer, the Divine Personality, Agnosticism and Evolution. It is, perhaps, superfluous to say that one may not always be satisfied with our author's treatment of a great question; that on such a subject, for example, as that of our Lord's knowledge, or on any deep matter of the Incarnation, one would prefer to read Athanasius or Leo. And some readers will think they have just reason for criticism in that they are at times left with a conjecture when, it will seem to them, there might be and ought to be a strong conclusion. Still, his aim must be kept in mind, and his work be judged by its adaptation to its own purpose. And thus viewed, it will be regarded as of great value: a book of mark; of encouragement and hope: to sceptics—not willfully and viciously such—opening a way out of darkness into light, and suggesting to believing men something—it may be in manner and spirit, it may be in the form or substance of an argument—which shall be serviceable to them in their work for the Christian faith.

SYLVESTER CLARKE.

Berkeley Divinity School.

PRESBYTERIANS. A Popular Narrative of their Origin, Progress, Doctrines and Achievements. By Rev. GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D., LL.D. With Introductions by Rev John Hall, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. William E. Moore, D.D.,

LL.D. New York: J. A. Hill & Co., 1892, 8vo, pp. 544.

In his preface, Dr. Hays tells us: "This book is for church-members, officers, and busy pastors, rather than for theological professors or private antiquarians." We are glad that theological professors are not debarred from the pleasure of reading it, for the pleasure of so doing is real and great.

Such a book was needed. There was a niche just ready to receive it, and Dr. Hays has filled it in a most admirable manner. It is just such a book as pastors will be delighted to put into the hands of their people, that they may know what they need to know about their own church. It is a book that the people will read, for it is written in Dr. Hays' racy and interesting style. To give an account of the other Presbyterian churches in the country was a happy thought, which has been well carried out by an eminent minister of each one of those denominations writing a sketch of his own church. Dr. M. D. Hoge's account of the Southern Presbyterian Church makes us still regret the causes which led to the separation, and the vanishing hope, as it seems, of a reunion. In the history of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, by Drs. Howard and Hubbert, the differences of that church from the other members of the Presbyterian family in doctrine are definitely and sharply drawn. They claim to have found the true *via media* between Calvinism and Arminianism. The same thing was attempted long ago by Richard Baxter, and was known as Baxterianism, which was not very long lived. How long it may continue to be so now, time alone will reveal. One cannot read this history of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church without being reminded of some of the tendencies in the Northern Presbyterian Church at the present time.

We think Dr. Hays has been generally fair and impartial to all the varied interests of the Church, and is, upon the whole, a reliable historian. A careful perusal of the book has failed to detect any departure from strict historical accuracy. Some of the institutions of learning will think that scant justice has been done them; but it should be borne in mind that to have given them all the space they would have liked would have increased the size and cost of the work. No history ever does or can relate everything. And, therefore, all history is and must be more or less eclectic. Something must, therefore, be treated briefly or not at all. The publishers have in general done their part well. The paper is good, the printing excellent, and the general make-up attractive. Concerning the illustrations, which ordinarily make a book so much more attractive, we cannot say so

much. They are well chosen, and some of them, like John Knox and Rev. Finis Ewing, are good enough; but some others are very bad. Owing to the want of stronger lines and lack of shading they are without expression, and remind one of the ghosts of departed worthies.

In spite of this drawback the book will be read with interest and profit by thousands, and is worthy of being read by all Presbyterians everywhere. We heartily congratulate Dr. Hays on the successful issue of his undertaking.

WILLIAM ALEXANDER.

San Francisco Theological Seminary,
Sunny Side, Cal.

BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTICES,

BY THE EDITOR.

The City and the Land is the title of the latest volume of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and it contains a course of seven lectures on the work of the "Fund" as it has been prosecuted for many years. (New York: Macmillan, 1892, 8vo, pp. 238.) "Ancient Jerusalem" is described by Sir Charles Wilson, whose name will ever be connected with the underground researches beneath the Holy City which revealed so much to Bible students. "The Future of Palestine" is the topic of Major Conder's lecture. If it be true that a knowledge of the past and present is a qualification of the modern prophet, Major Conder is competent. At all events, he gives much contemporary information. Canon Tristram's lecture was upon "The Natural History of Palestine," and Walter Besant, known in this country as a novelist, but long the accomplished secretary of the "Fund," gives a very interesting sketch of "The General Work of the Society." Dr. William Wright, well known as a writer upon Hittite subjects, gives a polemical paper upon "The Hittites," in which he reviews some of the facts given in his former publications, and pours scorn upon those who were hardy enough to express their scepticism as to the absolute trustworthiness of his early conjectures. "The Story of a 'Tell'" is told by W. M. Flinders Petrie, the well-known excavator, who has been named as the incumbent of the chair of Egyptology founded by the late Miss Edwards. The "Tell" was the mound which concealed and contained the remnants of the old city of Lachish, and the account of the discoveries begun by Petrie and continued by Bliss reads like a romance. It is of interest to add a fact not mentioned by Professor Petrie—that Mr. Frederick J. Bliss is an American (though a native of Syria) and a graduate of Amherst College and Union Theological Seminary. He has already done excellent work in Pales-

tinian exploration. The final lecture was on "The Modern Traveller in Palestine," by Canon Dalton. It is all too brief, but full of useful suggestions for those who would profit by a journey through the Holy Land. The lectures themselves and the book thus published are calculated to sustain the interest of the public in the exploration of Palestine. The work is only begun. The vistas of possibility, such as that mentioned by Petrie in connection with Greek influence in Palestine in early times, are almost endless, and are immensely attractive. The book should be widely read.

From Randolph & Company we have received four little volumes of considerable value and interest. They are the first issues of a series of "Guild and Bible Class Text-Books" issued under the editorship of Professor Charteris, of Edinburgh, on behalf of the "Life and Work Committee of the Church of Scotland." The titles are *The New Testament and Its Writers*, by Rev. J. A. McClymont, B.D. (pp. vi., 155); *Handbook of Christian Evidences*, by Alexander Steuart, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Aberdeen (pp. ix., 94); *Life and Conduct*, by J. Cameron Lees, D.D., LL.D., of Edinburgh (pp. viii., 114); and *The Church of Scotland*, a sketch of its history, by Rev. Pearson M. Adam Muir, of Edinburgh (pp. iv., 98). The first is a brief, clear and yet satisfactory introduction to the New Testament writings. It is a difficult task, but it has been performed with credit, and the book is one which will be found useful in the hands of Bible-class scholars and Sabbath-school teachers. The second volume is one which pastors will find useful and instructive in leading the studies of classes of young men. *Life and Conduct* is a handbook for instruction in Christian living and in ethics. It is admirably written and will be found helpful. The last is a brief history which in short space gives one a compact view of the Scotch Church from the beginning onward. It is very vivid, in view of its brevity, and deserves the wide circulation which it has already enjoyed. The same statement might be made of the other three volumes mentioned.

Studies in the Book. Old Testament—First Series. *Genesis*. By Professor Revere F. Weidner, D.D. (New York and Chicago: Revell Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 141, \$1.) Though prepared for the use of the students of Mr. Moody's Bible Institute, this volume is intended for use in Bible classes and in colleges where the English Bible is studied. It is not a commentary nor a question book, but a combination of both. The author relies mainly upon Delitzsch and Keil, with occasional references to

Murphy, and a few others. The position occupied by the author is conservative, holding to Mosaic authorship with the use of documents, but the critical partition is entirely rejected. For convenience in making notes it is interleaved.

A little volume of no small interest to Presbyterians historically inclined is entitled *The Church on the Elizabeth River*: a memorial of the 210th anniversary of the First Presbyterian Church of Norfolk, Va., 1682-1892. (Richmond: Whittet & Shepperson, 12mo, pp. 80.) It was by some supposed that the Elizabeth River church was the first of Presbyterian churches in America, but investigation has disproved this view. The history of both church and pastors is of interest, nevertheless, even if the highest claim that can be justified for the church is that "it is not only the oldest Presbyterian church in Virginia, but the oldest within the bounds of the Southern Presbyterian Church."

Some American Churchmen, by Frederic Cook Morehouse (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 240, \$1), is a collection of biographical sketches of Bishops Seabury, White, Hobart, Chase, Doane, Hopkins, and Kemper, and of Drs. Muhlenberg, Breck, and DeKoven. It is printed in large type, and the book is of considerable size, though the sketches are nearly all quite brief. They are, however, appreciative so far as they go, and give at least a partial idea of the men in question. But they are too brief to be entirely satisfactory to adult readers.

My Septuagint is the singular title by which Dr. Charles Force Deems, pastor of the Church of the Strangers, in this city, calls his latest publication. (Cassell Publishing Co., 12mo, pp. 208.) The name was suggested by the fact that the contents of the book have been prepared since the author's seventy-second birthday anniversary. The pieces thus given to the world breathe the genial spirit of the man who claims one of the longest pastorates in the city. It is with regret that one is called upon to note the fact that at the time of writing he is laid aside from active labor. The characteristic which strikes one in this volume is the breadth of view which the author takes in connection with some of the questions of the day. It would be well if others could learn of him the soundness of view and sweetness of temper here displayed.

Most Reverend John Hughes, First Archbishop of New York. By Henry A. Brann, D.D., rector of St. Agnes' Church. ("Makers of America" series. New York: Dodd & Mead, 1892, 12mo, pp. 182, \$1.) Dr.

Brann has presented a sympathetic account of Archbishop Hughes, and has recounted in brief outline a very remarkable career; but even in this representation are to be seen the grounds upon which antagonism was aroused in many quarters. Nevertheless one is compelled to admire the forceful characteristics of the man and the high estimate which he placed upon his prerogatives. The author has scarcely done himself justice in point of literary finish, though allowance must be made for certain blemishes on account of the necessary limitations of space. Protestant readers will take offence at some of the epithets used, which add nothing to the strength of the book, and which might easily have been omitted.

The Story of Sicily, Phœnician, Greek, and Roman. By Edward A. Freeman, Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1892, 12mo, pp. xvi., 378, \$1.50.) Professor Freeman was undoubtedly right in saying that the best preparation for writing a "short" history is to have written a long one. In the present work we have a volume complete in itself, but only one half of the history. It is, however, the production of a master and is worthy of the place which it occupies in the "Stories of the Nations." Though Sicily was never a "nation," it nevertheless occupied a unique position and its story is one of great interest, for from its central location in the ancient world it was the scene of conflicts which decided the fate of peoples on the wider field of the world. The volume is a welcome addition to our historical libraries.

The Doctrine of God, by the Rev. Francis J. Hall, M.A. (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co., 1892, 16mo, pp. 148, 50 cents, net), is the first volume of a series of "Theological Outlines" by the "Instructor of Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill." With some of the statements of this book we are in no sort of accord. "In Exegetical Theology, the truths and principles which are taught by the Church and arranged in Systematic Theology are established and illustrated by a critical analysis and interpretation of the contents of Holy Scripture" (p. 23). This reverses the Protestant order. "... the authority by which inspiration is attested is the Catholic Church" (p. 37). This is Romish; the Protestant view makes the Witness of the Holy Spirit in the Scripture its attestation. "Every part [of the Bible] is divinely inspired and is of equal authority, when interpreted in accordance with its organic relation to the whole course of revelation." This is, in part, misleading, or it is nonsense. "But the Bible is useful to prove what the Church teaches." In

other words, it is only an arsenal where ammunition is stored ready for use. Such a view of the Bible is simply unspeakable.

The Divine Art of Preaching. By Arthur T. Pierson. (New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. xvi., 156, 75 cents.) "Lectures delivered at the 'Pastor's College,' connected with the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London, England, from January to June, 1892." When Dr. Pierson took Mr. Spurgeon's place, among the duties which fell to his lot was that of giving instruction in the "Pastor's College," which had been such an important branch of the work of the pastor of the Metropolitan Tabernacle. Called suddenly to perform this labor, carefully studied preparation was out of the question, and the lectures here reproduced from stenographic notes were a sort of involuntary outpouring of the results of the preacher's year-long practice. For this reason they possess a value which a more elaborate treatise might lack, though they do not lay claim to the completeness which the subject justifies.

The Democracy of Christianity, or equality in the dealings of God with men, by Rev. Lorenzo White, A.M. (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892, 12mo, pp. 307, \$1.25), deals with the question of probation from the Arminian standpoint, as based upon "equality of advantage in the trial-life for gaining heaven." "Obviously a reasonable probation must have as foundation principles—in man absolute freedom of moral agency, and in God equity in its appointments and requirements. These premises logically involve essential equality." The author proposes to exhibit "two closely related truths," "the absolute freedom of man upon probational issues to choose for himself and from his own character, and to all who are held to the responsibilities of probation perfect equality of opportunity for securing the favor of God and eternal life." The author is in parts of his book decidedly rationalistic and extra-scriptural as well as contra-biblical. In fact, the Scripture is conspicuous by its absence. We submit that in treating of the "Democracy" of Christianity, Christianity's charter should receive more attention than Mr. White has given it. A philosophical treatise is one thing, but a statement of Christian doctrine rests upon a different basis. The basis for a decision between Arminian and Calvinistic views must rest upon their common source, and the true doctrine must be deduced therefrom by a correct system of exegesis and induction. In departing therefrom and stating what "must" be, apart from what "is" existent in the world of fact and in the world of biblical teaching, one enters upon dangerous ground. The author often

obscures his meaning by a style which is far from clear, and which resembles an extempore method of verbal discourse more than the careful style of literary diction.

The Model Sunday-School. A handbook of principles and practices. By George M. Boynton, Secretary of the Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society (Boston and Chicago, 16mo, pp. 175, 75 cents), has a practical aim, being the outgrowth of suggestions made during a conference between the secretary and his agents. Having such a genesis, there is no surprise that it proves to be a book which justifies its existence, and gives promise of being of immense assistance to a multitude of teachers and others who have felt the need of the mature advice here given. It is worthy of study and careful consideration. It abounds in hints which will prove of great importance in the successful prosecution of the work, whose interests the author has so nearly at heart, and it should be placed in the hands of teachers that they may rise to an appreciation of their high office and great responsibilities.

The work of the Y. M. C. A. has become so widespread and so important, that a volume which gives a full and authentic account of the various operations and methods employed will be welcomed by a large number of persons besides those immediately connected with an association. Such a volume is that recently issued by the International Committee. (40 East Twenty-third Street, New York City, crown 8vo, pp. 448, appendix of forms and index, \$2.) It is entitled *A Handbook of the History, Organization, and Methods of Work of Young Men's Christian Associations*. The editors are H. S. Ninde, J. T. Bovene, and Erskine Uhl, all well-known and successful workers in this branch of Christian labor. While intended primarily for the instruction and education of those who are already engaged in the work, or looking forward to such employment, the handbook is calculated to give detailed and accurate information to those whose interest is only secondary and whose knowledge is very inadequate. This information will be found to extend to all branches and details, such as can be found nowhere else. It is, therefore, a work of prime importance and of great value.

Victory through Surrender. A message concerning consecrated living. By the Rev. B. Fay Mills. (New York: Revell, pp. 82, 50 cents.) Mr. Mills is known over the whole continent as a successful evangelist and worker. A book treating of such a subject as this from his pen will be

welcomed and widely read. In it will be found a treatment eminently biblical, with a multitude of scriptural illustrations. Occasionally a sentence may be found which carries a one-sided view of truth to an extreme, thus placing emphasis where it does not belong, but the book as a whole will be helpful to many.

From the Pyramids to the Acropolis: Sacred places seen through biblical spectacles (pp. 21-288), and *Ready! ay, Ready!* and other addresses (pp. 21-232). By T. De Witt Talmage. (Philadelphia: Historical Publishing Co., 1892, 12mo, \$1.) Let no one think that the former of these books is an account of travel. It is a volume of sermons suggested by the scenes through which the traveller passed. Like the other volume, it is an illustration of the wonderful faculty of the man for homiletical illustration. To a wide circle of hearers and admirers these volumes, bound in white and gold, will be welcome. The critic, however, will scarcely be able to discover the secret of the power which the preacher wields from day to day.

The Philosophy of the Real Presence. By Robert A. Holland, S.T.D. (New York: Whittaker, 2d ed., 1893, pp. 33, 25 cents.) A piece of brilliant English composition, but scarcely satisfactory in its results to those who hold to a "real presence" more actual than that of a friend in a photograph or of a nation in its flag.

Lead Me to the Rock is the title of a little volume by the Rev. T. W. Hooper, D.D., published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication (Philadelphia, 12mo, pp. 174, 60 cents). It is difficult to find any sufficient reason for its publication, except such as is given in the dedication to the people under the author's previous pastoral charge. The contents are good, truly, but the volume is scarcely one to command an extensive circulation.

The Holy Ordinance of Marriage. Arranged by Rev. George E. Merrill. (Boston: Silver, Burdette & Co., 1892, pp. 47.) This is something novel in the line of a marriage certificate. It consists of selections from Scripture, a marriage form modelled after the Episcopal ritual, but with wide departures therefrom, a certificate to be filled out, and hymns. The service is simple but excellent, and it has been used acceptably by the author for several years. The whole is bound in white and gold, giving a very neat appearance.

The Beasts of Ephesus. By Rev. James Brand, D.D., pastor First Congregational Church, Oberlin, O. With an introduction by Rev. Francis E. Clark, D.D., President United Society of Christian Endeavor.

(Chicago: Advance Publishing Co., 1892, 12mo, pp. 206.) The "beasts" are those temptations and enticements which assail young people. It is possible that this volume will find readers among such, but we apprehend that it will prove to be of more service to pastors, parents, and teachers who have to do with settling questions for the young and directing their early steps in right paths.

Timely Topics, political, biblical, ethical, practical, discussed by college presidents professors, and eminent writers of our time. (New York: E. B. Treat, 1892, 12mo, pp. 361.) This volume contains a series of papers contributed to the *Treasury Magazine* by a company of men more or less widely known in the churches, and more or less competent for their tasks. The main topics treated are the papacy and jesuitism, prelacy, episcopacy, the ministry, ethics and morals, temperance, biblical criticism, Christian and secular education. The papers are of unequal merit, and occasionally represent different sides of the questions discussed. The general tendency of the volume is conservative, but with that the lover of truth need have no quarrel, if only his opponent share in the same desire to attain to verity. The great obstacle is prejudice, greater than ignorance, and of both of these this volume furnishes samples. In an article upon the "higher criticism," by Professor Terry, of Garrett Biblical Institute, is found a piece of practical advice well worth quotation and thought. "Writers who identify higher criticism with rationalism are not only guilty of misrepresenting the issues of criticism on this subject, but they prejudice fair-minded students by irrational methods of defending what they hold to be the truth." "There is no probability that the great body of biblical critics will be willing to persist in any palpable sophistry." These are the words of a fair-minded and honest man, whatever his critical views may be.

A recent volume serves to call attention to a change of customs and manners since "The Present Crisis," in 1775, in England closed the list of books condemned to be publicly burned. Since then the fire of the critic has taken the place of the fire of the hangman, with the difference that the former has not uniformly reduced the circulation of the condemned volumes. Mr. James Anson Farrer, in *Books Condemned to be Burnt* (New York: Armstrong & Son, 12mo, pp. xi., 206), has given a very readable and clear account of the English books which have met this fate. He has certainly succeeded in giving "something less dull than a dictionary," but which so far as it goes is not "something far short of a history." It

is a book for the curious, the lover of letters, and the student of manners, and it contains a large amount of interesting and instructive fact.

The name of Dr. William F. Poole is one that will be remembered by multitudes to whom "Poole's Index" to periodical literature has been a friend, a guide in a wilderness. A recent volume issued from the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Co. (Boston and New York), under the auspices of the American Library Association and the editorship of William I. Fletcher, librarian of Amherst College, proposes to do a similar service for the field of literature as the same is found in volumes of collected essays, books which treat of various subjects under a single title, sociological, educational, statistical, and miscellaneous reports. It is restricted to English books, and to such of these as are usually found in an ordinary library. This is a step in a direction where much-needed help can be given, and there is no doubt that the assistance thus rendered will be appreciated. We can heartily say, let the good work go on. (*An Index to General Literature*, 1893, 8vo, pp. v., 329, \$5.)

THE MARCH MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for March contains: Frontispiece, "Dance at the Ponce de Leon," "Our Own Riviera," by Julian Ralph; "The Face on the Wall" (a story), by Margaret Deland; "The Escorial," by Theodore Child; "Monochromes" (poems), by W. D. Howells; "My Upper Shelves" (a poem), by Richard Burton; "The Refugees," a tale of two continents, by A. Conan Doyle, Part III.; "Washington Society," I., Official, by Henry Loomis Nelson; "Horace Chase" (a novel), by Constance Fenimore Woolson, Part III.; "Slavery and the Slave Trade in Africa," by Henry M. Stanley; "An American in Africa," by Richard Harding Davis; "Editor's Study," by Charles Dudley Warner; "Editor's Drawer," by Thomas Nelson Page; "Gentle Terrorism," full-page illustration drawn by George du Maurier; "Monthly Record of Current Events."

THE CENTURY for March contains: "Portrait of Napoleon," frontispiece; "The Violoncello of Jurof Rosenboom," Anna Elchberg King; "An Embassy to Provence," II., Thomas A. Janvier; "Silence," Maria Bowen Chapin; "Napoleon's Deportation to Elba," by the Officer in Charge, Thomas Ussher, R. N.; "Jamaica," Gilbert Gaul; "Letters of Two Brothers," passages from the correspondence of General and Senator Sherman, William Tecumseh Sherman and John Sherman; "Caprice," N., "Westminster Abbey," Henry B. Fuller; "The Rousing of Mrs. Potter," Gertrude Smith; "The Present State of Old Testament Criticism," Edward Lewis Curtiss; "Chicago," Marion Conthouy Smith; "Meridian," Charles T. Dazey; "Camille Saint-Saëns," Henry E. Krehbiel; "Have ye Niver Heerd Tell o' Rose Creagan?" Jennie E. T. Dowe; "My Sister Lydia," from a painting by Edmund C. Tarbell; "Sweet Bells Out of Tune," V., Mrs. Burton Harrison; "The Dead King," George Horton; "Artist Life by the North Sea," H. W. Ranger; "One Touch of Nature," Edgar Fawcett; "At the Keith Ranch," Anna Fuller; "Benefits Forgot," IV., Wolcott Balestier;

"The Cosmopolis City Club," III., What the Club Accomplished, Washington Gladden; "Topics of the Time," "Open Letters," "In Lighter Vein."

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for March, contents: "March," frontispiece; "Audubon's Story of His Youth," by Maria R. Audubon; "The Jaffa and Jerusalem Railway," by Selah Merrill; "The One I Knew the Best of All: a Memory of the Mind of a Child," by Frances Hodgson Burnett; "A Saharan Caravan," by A. F. Jaccaci; "The Man in Red," by T. R. Sullivan; "The French Symbolists," by Aline Gorren; "The Violin," by Harriet Prescott Spofford; "The Cedars," drawn by C. P. Cranch; "The Work of the Andover House in Boston," by William Jewett Tucker; "The Tale of a Goblin Horse" by Charles C. Nott; "Ezra Hardman, M.A.," by Schuyler Shelton; "Wood Songs," III., by Arthur Sherburne Hardy; "Historic Moments: The Death of John Quincy Adams in the Capitol," by Robert C. Winthrop; "The Point of View."

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for March, contents: "Old Kaskaskia" (in four parts), part third, Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "Admiral the Earl of St. Vincent," A. T. Mahan; "Mom Cely's Wonderful Luck," Elizabeth W. Bellamy; "Persian Poetry," Sir Edward Strachey; "Of a Dancing-Girl," Lafcadio Hearn; "Garden Ghosts," James B. Kenyon; "Random Reminiscences of Emerson," William Henry Furness; "On Growing Old," H. C. Merwin; "My College Days," I., Edward E. Hale; "Words," Agnes Repplier; "An English Family in the Seventeenth Century," John Foster Kirk; "A Seventeenth-Century Song," Louise Imogen Guiney; "The Ancestry of Genius," Havelock Ellis; "A Great Lady of the French Restoration," "Pagan and Christian Rome," "Symonds's Life of Michelangelo," "Paul Heyse," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributors' Club."

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for March, contents: "Waring's Peril," Captain Charles King, U. S. A.; "The Newspaper Woman's Story," Elizabeth G. Jordan; "The Light-House," Edith M. Thomas; "Hope Deferred," Lillian A. North; "Some Queer Trades," Charles Robinson; "A Rose," Florence Earle Coates; "Marie Burroughs," Robert Edgarton; "A Rose of the Mire," Kate Jordan; "The Ripples and the Pool," Herbert Ditchett; "The Selfishness of Mourning," C. H. Crandall; "Our Side of the Question," Louise Stockton; "Men of the Day," M. Crofton.

THE CONTENTS OF THE COSMOPOLITAN for March are: "Berlin," Friedrich Spielhagen; "Slander," Edgar Fawcett; "The Abyssal Depths of the Sea," J. Carter Beard; "In our Cotton Belt," H. S. Fleming; "The Story of a Boy's Club," E. E. Hale; "Belated Bloom," W. H. Hayne; "A Royal Ruin," Grace Ingersoll Bigelow; "The Fruit of Sorrow," Flavel Scott Mines; "The Great Trans-Siberian Railway," Valerian Gribayedoff; "Conquered," Julien Gordon; "For Music," Frank Dempster Sherman; "Women Experts in Photography," Clarence B. Moore; "An Italian Campo Santo," Murat Halstead; "The British Navy," S. Eardley-Wilmot; "Cervantes, Zola, Kipling & Co.," Brander Matthews; "The House of the Dragons," Ida M. Van Etten; "March," Elizabeth Stoddard; "The Great Congresses at the World's Fair," Ellen M. Henriotin; "Photographed," John B. Tabb; "A Traveller from Aithuria," W. D. Howells; "Pastel," Henry Tyrrell.

THE AMERICAN REVIEW OF REVIEWS is to be commended for its enterprise in having secured from the pen of Archdeacon Farrar a most brilliant tribute, as also a most frank and personal one, to the life and character of the late Bishop Phillips Brooks. Dr. Farrar was Phillips Brooks's most intimate and confidential English friend, and this article must of necessity be read with the keenest interest by the American admirers of the great preacher. President Thwing, of Adelbert College, Cleveland, contributes also an eloquent and warm tribute to the great power of Phillips Brooks as a preacher.

INDEX OF PERIODICALS, FEBRUARY, 1893.

Abbreviations of Magazine Titles used in the Index of Periodicals.

- Af. M. E. R. African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)
 A. R. Andover Review.
 B. S. Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)
 B. W. The Biblical World.
 B. Q. R. Baptist Quarterly Review.
 Ch. Q. R. Church Quarterly Review.
 C. M. Q. Canadian Methodist Quarterly.
 C. P. R. Cumberland Presbyterian Review. (Quarterly.)
 C. R. Charities Review.
 C. T. Christian Thought.
 Ex. Expositor.
 Ex. T. Expository Times.
 G. W. Good Words.
 H. R. Homiletic Review.
 L. Q. Lutheran Quarterly.
 M. R. Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)
 M. H. Missionary Herald.
 Aesthetic in Religion, The, J. W. Wright, MR.
 Armstrong, J. Z. J. Parker, TTr.
 Baptism in the Economy of Grace, The Position of, J. B. Grubbs, NCQ.
 Beliefs, Man's Responsibility for his, G. R. W. Scott, CT.
 Bethesda, Christ at the Pool of, G. A. Chadwick, Ex.
 Brainerd, David, W. D. Sexton, MissR.
 Brotherhood of Christian Unity, The, Theodore F. Seward, NCQ.
 Browning's Philosophy of Art, D. Dorchester, Jr., AR.
 Chicago, Charities and Correction in, H. H. Hart, CR.
 Children in the West, Placing out New York, Francis H. White, CR.
 Christianity, Applied, Ch. W. Clark, AR.
 Church Movement of 1833, A Layman's Recollections of, G. W., NHM.
 Criticism, The Higher, B. W. Johnson, NCQ.
 Educational Statistics, Some Recent, W. H. Norton, MR.
 Eternal Verities, C. V. Anthony, MR.
 Ethnic Religions and Christianity, A Comparative View of, T. McKendree Stuart, MR.
 Gethsemane, Geo. Plattenburg, NCQ.
 God's Imperative Entreaty, John Z. Armstrong, TTr.
 Gospel in Nature, The, H. H. Moore, MR.
 Hadesian Theology, CT.
 Hayes, Ex-President R. B., William M. F. Round, CR.
 Hezekiah, Sargon, and Sennacherib, Joseph Horner, MR.
 High Priest of our Profession, The, Prof. Charteris, GW.
 Holy Scripture, The Inerrancy of the, F. F. Adenweller, NCQ.
 Home of a Naturalist, The, A. J. Vignoles GW.
 Inspiration of the Scriptures, The, J. Monro Gibson, PM.
 Jew, Mission Fields, The, C. M. Alford, TTr.
 Job, Messianic Prophecy in the Book of, E. L. Curtis, BW.
 John, First Epistle of, G. G. Findlay, Ex.
 Jonah, The Book of, A. Crawford, PER.
 Judaism, The Expansion of, Oliver J. Thatcher, BW.
 Jude's Doxology, A. T. Pierson, TTr.
 Labor Problem, The, William O. McDowell, CT.
 Livery Companies, Leaves from the History of the, Charles Welch, NHM.
 Lodging-Houses of London, The Common, Andrew Mearns, SM.
 Mexico, Inquisition of, Laura M. Latimer, MissR.
 Milton, The Theology of, Franklin McElfresh, MR.
 Milton, Local Memories of, David Masson, GW.
 Minor Prophets, Wellhausen's, John Taylor, Ex.
 Mission Churches, The Question of Endowing, Edward Judson, MissR.
 Missions the Salvation of the Church, James Mathieson, MissR.
 Missions, the Overflow of, A. J. Gordon, MissR.
 Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Papal Lands, Arthur B. Kinsolving, PER.
 Moses, His Life and its Lessons, Mark Guy Pearse, PM.
 Mount Athos, J. D. Mahaffy, SM.
 Murray of Samoa, Robert Steel, MissR.
 Name and the Nature, The, J. Reid Howatt, SM.
 New Testament, Survey of Literature on, Marcus Dods, Ex.
 Orthodoxy, The New and the Old, George A. Gordon, AR.
 Pantheistic Tendencies Unfavorable to Permanence in Creed, O. T. Lanphear, HR.
 Parisian Municipal Refuges for Working Women, Helen Zimmer, CR.
 Pastor and the Inquirer, The, T. L. Cuyler, HR.
 Paul's Conception of Christianity, A. B. Brune, Ex.
 Peter, Newly Discovered Apocryphal Gospel of, Isaac H. Hall, BW.
 Poetry do for the Ministry? What can, Arthur D. Hoyt, HR.
 Poor Law, Our, J. R. Crawford, NHM.
 Prayer in the Church of England, Special Forms of, J. Charles Cox, NHM.
 Prayer, The Divine Consciousness of Human, John Steinfort Kedney, PER.
 Preach, Training Men to, E. G. Robinson, HR.
 Preaching, Present-Day, S. H. Kellogg, PM.
 Preaching and Read Sermons, Extempore, David Brook, PM.
 Preaching, Sensational, David J. Barrett, CT.
 Progress in Religion, H. W. Everest, NCQ.
 Progress of the Churches, The, Archdeacon Farrar, J. Reid Howatt, Dr. Mackennal, Dr. Clifford, P. W. Bunting, RCh.
 Public Schools, Religious Instruction, N. S. Burton, AR.
 Religious Chasm in England, The, W. Darbon, NCQ.
 Sanitation in Relation to the Poor, William H. Welch, CR.
 Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries, Light on, William Hayes Ward, HR.
 Selby Abbey, Henry Hayman, NHM.
 Semitic Study, A Plea for, J. H. Blake, NCQ.
 Sermons, How Men Get their, John Edwards, PM.
 Spencerian Theory of the Religion of Israel, The, C. R. Blauvelt, CT.
 Synoptic Problem, Some Points in the, V. H. Stanton, Ex.
 Temperance Legislation, A Suggested Compromise on, Hugh Price Hughes, RCh.
 Tendency of his Teaching? How Far is a Man Responsible for what is Called the, B. A. Greene, AR.

Tendency, A Study of, D. A. Goodsell, MR.
Theological Instruction in Switzerland, P. W. Snyder, B.W.
Usury and Interest, The Ethic of, Alfred Bishop Mason, CR.
Version in Public Worship, The Revised, Edward Abbott, PER.
Voice from Heaven, A., J. Westby Earnshaw, TTR.
Westminster Abbey, The Statuary in, Archdeacon Farrar, GW.
Whateley, Archbishop, Bishop Randolph, PER.
Whittier, J. G., F. C. Iglehart, MR.
Women: their Needs and Helpers, L. E. Bidding, NHM.
Y. M. C. A.'s a Dismal Failure? Are, W. H. Miller, the Archdeacon of London, Professor Shuttleworth, J. Guinness Rogers, RCh.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, January-February, 1893.

The Contrast and Agreement between the New Orthodoxy and the Old.
Applied Christianity: Who Shall Apply it First?
Religious Instruction in Public Schools.
Browning's Philosophy of Art.
How Far is a Person Responsible for what is Called the Tendency of his Teaching?

THE BIBLICAL WORLD.

Chicago, February, 1893.

The Newly Discovered Apocryphal Gospel of Peter.
The Expansion of Judaism.
Theological Instruction in Switzerland.
Messianic Prophecy in the Book of Job.
Historical Studies in the Scriptural Material of the International Lesson.

THE CHARITIES REVIEW.

New York, February, 1893.

Ex-President Rutherford B. Hayes.
Situation in Relation to the Poor.
Placing Out New York Children in the West.
The Parisian Municipal Refuges for Working Women.
The Ethic of Usury and Interest.
Charities and Correction in Chicago in 1893.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.

New York, February, 1893.

Man's Responsibility for His Beliefs.
The Spencerian Theory of the Religion of Israel.
The Labor Problem: Cause and Remedy.
Hadesian Theology.
Sensational Preaching.
A Year among the Churches.

THE EXPOSITOR.

London, February, 1893.

Some Points in the Synoptic Problem.
The Preface to the First Epistle of John.
Wellhausen's "Minor Prophets."
Paul's Conception of Christianity.
Christ at the Pool of Bethesda.
Survey of Literature on the New Testament.

GOOD WORDS.

London, February, 1893.

The High Priest of Our Profession.
The Home of a Naturalist.
The Statuary in Westminster Abbey.
Local Memories of Milton.
The Influence of Christ on Character.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

Toronto, New York, London, February, 1893.

What Can Poetry do for the Ministry?
Training Men to Preach.
Pantheistic Tendencies Unfavorable to Permanence in Creed.
The Pastor and the Inquirer.
Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries.

METHODIST REVIEW.

New York, Cincinnati, January-February, 1893.

Whither?
The Gospel in Nature.
A Comparative View of the Ethnic Religions and Christianity.
John Greenleaf Whittier.
Some Recent Educational Statistics.
The Theology of Milton.
Hezekiah, Sargon, and Sennacherib.
The Aesthetic in Religion.
Eternal Verities.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW.

London, New York, Toronto March, 1893.

The Question of Endowing Mission Churches.
The Overflow of Missions.
Missions the Salvation of the Church.
The Inquisition in Mexico.
Rev. A. W. Murray, of Samoa.
David Brainerd.
East African Missions.

THE NEWBURY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, February, 1893.

Special Forms of Prayer in the Church of England.
Women: Their Needs and Helpers.
Leaves from the History of the Livery Companies.
A Layman's Recollections of the Church Movement of 1833.
Our Poor Law.
Selby Abbey.

THE NEW CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

St. Louis, January, 1893.

The Religious Chasm in England.
Progress in Religion.
Gethsemane.
The Higher Criticism.
A Plea for Semitic Study.
The Brotherhood of Christian Unity.
The Inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures.
Position of Baptism in the Economy of Grace.

THE PREACHERS' MAGAZINE.

New York, February, 1893.

Present Day Preaching.
Moses.
The Inspiration of the Scriptures.
Extempore Preaching and Read Sermons.
How Men Get their Sermons.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL REVIEW.

Virginia, February, 1893.

Archbishop Whateley.
The Divine Consciousness of Human Prayer.
The Revised Version in Public Worship.
The Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Papal Lands.
The Book of Jonah.

REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

London, January, 1893.

The Progress of the Churches.
Lord Plunket.
Are Y. M. C. A.'s a Dismal Failure?
A Suggested Compromise on Temperance Legislation.

THE SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

London, February, 1893.

Mount Athos.
The Common Lodging-Houses of London.
Silas K. Hocking.
The Name and the Nature.
One in Charity.
Hope.

THE TREASURY.

New York, February 1893.

God's Imperative Entreaty.
Jude's Doxology.
A Voice from Heaven.
J. Z. Armstrong.
Thoughts on Questions of the Day.
Mission Fields: The Jew.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE, CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY THE REV. GEORGE W. GILMORE, M.A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Ah, J. J. von. Della Vita e delle opere di San Carlo Borromeo, arcivescovo di Milano et cardinale di chiesa. Traduzione dal Tedesco pel G. M. Bhancheiti. Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1893. Pp. 171, 8vo, 5.30 mk.

Althaus, P. Die historischen und dogmatischen Grundlagen der lutherischen Taufkirche. Vortrag, Hannover: Fiesche, 1892. Pp. lii., 102, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Arnaud, E. Supplément aux Synodes du désert de M. Edmond Hugues, renfermant vingt et un Synodes ou colloques inédits du Désert du Dauphiné. Paris: Fischbacher, 1892. Pp. 60, 8vo.

Arthur, A. M. The Tongue of Fire; or, the True Power of Christianity. With a new preface by the author, and an introduction by the Rev. William M. Taylor, D.D. New York: Harpers, 1893. Pp. xxi., 350, 12mo.

Barry, A. Bp. Some Lights of Science on the Faith. Bampton Lecture, 1892. London: Longmans, 1893. Pp. 356, 8vo, 12s. 6d.

Bauer, J. Die Trostreden des Gregorius von Nyssa in ihrem Verhältnis zur antiken Rhetorik. Habilitationsschrift. Marburg, 1892. Pp. 90, 8vo.

Beecher, Henry Ward, Rev. Bible Studies. Readings in the early Books of the old familiar Covenant given in 1878-1879. Edited from stenographic notes of T. J. Billinwood, by John R. Howard. New York: Fords, 1893. Pp. 438, 8vo, \$1.50.

Beet, Joseph Agar, D.D. Through Christ to God. A study in scientific theology. New York: Meth. Bk. Conc., 1893. Pp. xx., 373, 8vo, \$1.50.

Bell, John J., Rev., ed. Words of Wisdom from the Scriptures. A concordance to the Scripture book; prepared from the French; edited with a preface by A. Magulien, D.D. New York: Benziger, 1893. 12mo, cloth.

Bestmann, H. J., Dr. Die Aufgaben der Kirche und ihrer Theologie in unserer Zeit. Ein theologisches Traktat auch für Nichttheologen. Kroppe: "Eben-Ezer," 1893. Pp. v., 77, 8vo, 80 pf.

Bibliotheca patrum latinorum britannica. Bearbeitet von Heinrich Schenkel. 1. Band. 2. Abtheilung. Die Philologische Bibliothek in Cheltenham. (910-2154.) Wien: Tempesky, 1893. Pp. 158, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Black, John Sutherland, M.A. The Book of Judges. With map, introduction and notes. (Oxford Cambridge Bible for Schools.) Oxford: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 116, 18mo, 30 cts.

Blake, Buchanan, B.D. How to Read the Prophets. Being the Prophets arranged chronologically in their historical setting. Part III. Jeremiah. New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. 257, 12mo, \$1.50.

Böhl, E. Prolegomena voor eene Gereformeerde dogmatiek. Amsterdam: Scheffer, 1892. Pp. iv., 108, 8vo, .75 fl.

Bois, H. Le Dogme Grec. Paris: Fischbacher, 1893. Pp. 300, 8vo, 3 fr.

Brann, M., Dr. Geschichte der Juden und ihrer Litteratur. Für Schule und Haus bearbeitet. 1. Theil. Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft bis zum Abschluss des Talmuds. Breslau: Jacobsohn, 1893. Pp. vii., 250, 8vo, 2 mk.

Briggs, Charles Augustus, Rev., D.D. The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch. New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. xli., 259, 8vo, \$1.75. [Also] The Defence of Professor Briggs before the Presbytery of New York, Dec. 13-15 and 19, 1892. New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. xx., 105, 8vo, paper, 50 cts.

Bristol, Sherlock, Rev. Paracletos; or, the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 183, 12mo.

Brown, R. The Hidden Mystery; or, the Revelations of the Word. Second and Concluding Series. London: Nisbet, 1893, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Bugge, F. W. Johannes-Evangeliet. Indledet, oversat og forklaret. 1. Heft. Christiania, 1892. Pp. 256, 8vo, [4.50 mk.]

Bungeroth, H. Der Simultanstaat. Seine Grundlage, sein positives Recht und seine Entwicklung. 4. Band. Das Zusammenleben der evangelischen und katholischen Bürger im Simultanstaate. Zur Erzählung eines dauernden Friedens beleuchtet. Barmen: Wiemann, 1893. Pp. x., 173, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

Caldi, G. Metodologia generale della Interpretazione scientifica. Vol. I. Torino: 1892. Pp. 317, 8vo, [10 mk.]

Calvini, Io. Opera quæ supersunt omnia. Ed. Gull. Baum. Ed. Cunitz, Ed. Reuss. Vol. 46-48. (Corpus Reformatorum, Vol. 74-76.) Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1893. Pp. viii., 923; viii., 484; viii., 464, 4to, each 12 mk.

Catholic Dogma. The fundamental truths of revealed religion. Lectures delivered in 1891 under the auspices of the Church Club of New York. New York: Young, 1892 [1893]. Pp. xi., 189, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts. [Six lectures: The Nature of Dogmas and its Obligation, by Bishop A. N. Littlejohn; The Holy Trinity, by W. R. Huntington, D.D.; The Incarnation, by Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D.; The Atonement, by John H. Elliott; The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit, by Bishop Davis Sessums; Grace and the Sacramental System, by Rev. G. H. S. Walpole.]

Chiuso, T. La Chiesa in Piemonte dal 1797 al giorni nostri. Vol. IV. Torino: Speirani, 1892. Pp. viii., 396, 8vo, 6 L.

Christian World Pulpit. Vol. 42. London: Clarke, 1893. 4to, 4s. 6d.

Church, R. W. Cathedral and University Sermons. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. viii., 317, 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

Church's, The. Ministry of Grace. Lectures delivered in 1892 under the auspices of the Church Club of New York; with appendices. New York: Young, 1893. Pp. xxxii., 361, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts. [Continuation of "Catholic Dogma" (see above). Baptism, by Rev. W. Clark; The Lord's Supper, by George McClellan Fleke, D.D.; Confirmation, by Dean Wilford L. Robins; Holy Orders, by Bishop Charles Garrett; Unction, Matrimony and Penance, by Bishop Charles C. Grafton.]

City, The, and the Plan. A course of seven lectures on the work of the Palestine Exploration Society, delivered in Hanover Square, in May and June, 1892. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 238, 8vo, \$1.25.

Cooke, A. R. Studies in Ephesians. New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 137, 12mo, 75 cts.

Collyer, Robert, Rev. Things New and Old. Sermons. New York: Dutton, 1893. Pp. iii, 208, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Congregational Year Book [for England], 1893. London: Congregational Union, 1893. 3s.

Cumming, J. E. Scripture Photographs: Men in the Sunlight of the World. Stirling: Drummond, 1893. Pp. 254, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Cuthbert, A. A. Questions on the Holy Scriptures, with Answers. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1893. Pp. 220, 8vo, 5s.

Daffner, Frz. Dr. Geschichte des Klosters Benediktsteden (704-1803), mit Berücksichtigung der allgemeinen Geschichte und der handschriftlichen Literatur. München: Huttler, 1893. Pp. iv., 432, 8vo, 10 mk.

Dann, A. G. George Webster, D.D.: a Memoir. With a preface by H. H. Dickinson. Dublin: McGee, 1893. Pp. 186, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

David, V. D. Cleansing, Purity, and Power. London: Marshall, 1893. Pp. 104, p. 8vo, 1s. [Religious Tracts.]

Deere, George H., D.D. Prayer. Boston: Univ. Pub. House, 1893. Pp. ii., 12mo, 25 cts.

De Faye, E. Les Apocalypses Juives. Essai de critique littéraire et théologique. Paris: 1892. Pp. 226, 8vo, 6 fr.

DeMott, John B., A. M., Ph.D. The Secret of Character Building. Chicago: Griggs, 1893. Pp. xii., 130, 12mo, \$1.00.

Ditchfield, P. H. The Church in the Netherlands. London: Gardner, 1893. P. 8vo, 6s. [National Churches Series.]

Dreves, G. M. Analecta hymnica mediæ ævi. XIII. Liturgische Hymnen des Mittelalters. 2. Folge. Aus Handschriften und Wiegendruck. Leipzig: Reissland, 1892. Pp. 266, 8vo, 8 mk.

Drummond, Henry, F.R.S.E. The City without a Church. An address. New York: Pott, 1893. Pp. 59, 12mo, 35 cts.

Elsdale, Rev. Dr. (ed.). Brevissima: For Busy People. Very short meditations for a year on the Gospel of St. John. London: Mowbray, 1893. 18mo, 2s. 6d.

Erdstein, Ch. Sde-Perachim. Talmudische und biblische Exegesen, rationell erklärt mit grammatikalischen und kritischen Bemerkungen, und mit einer psychologischen Einleitung, die sich auf die heilige Schrift stützt, versehen. Wien: Lippe, 1893. Pp. ii., 94, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Ewige Wahrheit. Die. Nach Inhalt der vier Evangelien kurz dargestellt von F. v. B. Berlin: Verlag für Sonntagsschulliteratur, 1892. Pp. iii., 76, 8vo, 80 pf.

Fabre, P. De Patrimonis romane ecclesie neque ad statum Carolinorum. Thèse. Lille: Danel, 1892. Pp. 120, 8vo.

Fairbairn, A. M. Christ in the Centuries, and Other Sermons. London: Low; New York: Dutton, 1893. Pp. 226, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d., \$1.25. (Preachers of the Age Series.)

Fischer, Fr. Biblischer Citatenschatz. Eine Vollständige, lexikalisch geordnete Sammlung von Citaten aus dem Alten und Neuen Testament. Leipzig: Malende, 1892. Pp. iv., 162, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Fleischer, F. C. Menno Simons. (1493-1559.) Eine Lebensschets. Amsterdam: Deelman, 1892. Pp. 34, 8vo, 50 fl.

Francken, Az. W. Jezus' getuigenis omtrent God naar de vier Evangelien. Opgedragen aan de theologische faculteit der Utrechtsche Rijks-Universiteit in 1886. Leiden: Brill, 1892. Pp. viii., 208, 8vo.

Froböss, G. Eduard Gustav Kellner. Ein Zeuge der lutherischen Kirche gewürdigt, um der Wahrheit willen zu leiden. Lebensbild, nach Briefen und Aufzeichnungen desselben entworfen. (Altes und Neues aus der lutherischen Kirche, 2. und 3. Bändchen.) Elberfeld: Baedeker, 1893. Pp. viii., 276, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

G., E. O. The Dotted Words in the Hebrew Bible. New York: Dillingham, 1893. Pp. 50, 12mo.

Gant, F. J. From Our Dead Selves to Higher Things. London: Nisbet, 1893. Pp. 190, p. 8vo-8s. 6d. [A religious essay.]

Gerold, Th. Edouard Reuss. Notice bio, graphique. Paris: Fischbacher, 1892. Pp. 87, 8vo, 1.50 fr.

Gerretsen, J. H. Rechtaardiging door het geloof bij Paulus. Eene bijdrage voor de nieuwtestamentische theologie. Nijmegen: ten Hoet, 1892. Pp. 39, 8vo, 40 fl.

Glassberg, A. J. Sichron B'rith Larischonim. Die rituelle Circumcision. 1. Band: Die Vorschriften und religiösen Gebräuche der Beschneidung, nach talmudischen und späteren Quellen bearbeitet. (In Hebräischer Sprache.) Berlin: Bibliogr. Bureau, 1893. Pp. xix., 314, 8vo, 4 mk.

Gollock, Georgina A. What's o' Clock? A Missionary Book for Boys and Girls. With preface by the Bishop of Osnabrück. London: Church Mission Society, 1893. Pp. 100, 4to, 1s. 6d. [Work of the Church Mission Society in different countries, arranged according to the relative time of day.]

Goossen, M. A. De Heidelbergsche Catechismus en het boekje van de breking des broods, in het jaar 1563-64 bestreden en verdedigd Oorkonden en dogmen-historisch onderzoek. Nieuwe bijdrage tot de kennis van het ge-reformeerde Protestantisme. Leiden: Brill, 1892. Pp. x., 424, 8vo.

Gratry, A. Guide to the Knowledge of God. A study of the chief Theologies. Translated by Abby Langdon Alger. With an introduction by William Rounceville Alger. Boston: Roberts, 1893. Pp. xl., 469, 8vo, \$3.00.

Guinness, M. Geraldine. The Story of the China Inland Mission. With an introduction by J. Hudson Taylor. 2 vols. Vol. I. London: Morgan, 1893. Pp. 480, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Gutzeit, Johs. Der Verbildungs-Spiegel: Untersuchungen über unsere morale Krankheiten. Eine Vorschule der Wiedergeburt. 1. Band. Scheinacht. Grossenhain: Baumert, 1893. Pp. xviii., 268, 8vo, 2 mk.

Haeckel, E. Der Monismus als Band zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft. Glaubensbekenntnis eines Naturforschers. Bonn: Strauss, 1892. Pp. 46, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Harnack, Ad. Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Herausgegeben von Oscar von Gebhardt und Adolf Harnack. 9. Band, 2. Heft.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893. Pp. iii., 78, 8vo, 2 mk.

Harper, William R., Ph.D. Inductive Bible Studies. Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon. Hartford: Student Pub. Co., 1893. 8vo.

Hase, Karl von. Geschichte der protestantischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert. (Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage Akademischer Vorlesungen. 2. Theil, 2. Abtheilung, 2. Hälfte, I.) Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. G. Krüger. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1893. Pp. iii., 359-728, 8vo, 6 mk.

Haukenaes, T. S. Religiøse Tanker. Bergen, 1892. Pp. 43, 8vo, [75 pf.]

Hiram Golf's Religion; or, the Shoemaker by the Grace of God. New York: Dutton, 1892. Pp. iii., 127, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Holder, Dr. Karl. Die Designation der Nachfolger durch die Päpste. Freiburg: Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1893. Pp. 113, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

Hopkins, E. H. Unclaimed Privileges. London: Marshall, 1893. Pp. 90, 18mo, 1s. [Religious addresses.]

Hoyt, Wayland, D.D. At His Feet. New York and St. Paul: Merrill, 1893. Pp. 312, 12mo, \$1.00.

Huntington, William Reed, D.D., D.C.L. A Short History of the Book of Common Prayer, together with Certain Papers Illustrative of Liturgical Revision, 1878-1892. New York: Whittaker, 1893. Pp. 235, 12mo, \$1.00.

Hurst, John Fleicher, D.D. Short History of the Christian Church. With maps. New York: Harpers, 1893. Pp. xxxv., 672, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

James, C. Moïse et Darwin. L'Homme de la Genèse comparé à L'Homme singe, ou l'enseignement religieux opposé à l'enseignement athée. Bruges: Desclée, 1892. Pp. vi., 395, 8vo, 4 fr.

Jangey, J. B. Diccionario apologético de la fe católica. 2 tomos. Madrid, 1892. Pp. 2215, 4to. [49 mk.]

Kerr, Alexander, and Tolman, Herbert Cushing. The Gospel of Matthew in Greek. Chicago: Kerr, 1893. Pp. xxv., 117, 8vo, \$1.00.

Kirkpatrick, A. P., D.D. The Doctrine of the Prophets. The Warburton Lectures for 1886-1890. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. xvii., 540, 12mo, \$1.75.

Krauss, Alfred, Prof., Dr. Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie. 2. (Schluss-) Band. Katechetik. Pastoraltheorie. Freiburg 1. Br.: Mohr, 1893. Pp. x., 461, 8vo, 2 mk.

Kukula, Richard C., Dr. Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur und der Kirche im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV., III. Theil. 1. Wien: Tempelky, 1893. Pp. 48, 8vo. 1.10 mk.

Lau, A. Johannes Tauler, Predigermonch in Strassburg, 1290-1361. Ein Lebensbild. Strassburg i. E.: Vornhoff, 1892. Pp. 36, 12mo, 30 pf.

Le Blanc d'Ambonne, P. Le Livre de la sagesse et les Psaumes CIX. à CXVI., allégoriquement expliqués. Précédés d'une introduction par F. de Salignac Fénelon. Nantes: Grimand, 1892. Pp. xix., 255, 8vo.

Lee, J. W. The Making of a Man. London: Hutchinson, 1893. Pp. 362, p. 8vo, 6s. [Man, physical, social, intellectual, moral, aesthetic, spiritual.]

Lees, J. Cameron, D.D. Life and Conduct. New York: Randolph, 1893. Pp. viii., 114, 16mo, 25 cts.

Leeuwen, E. H. van. Bijbelsche Godgeleerdheid. I. De leer aangaande God. Utrecht: Breijer, 1892. Pp. viii., 208, 8vo, 2 fl.

Lilly, William Samuel. The Great Enigma: A Contribution to the Apologetics of Theism. New York: Appleton, 1893. 8vo, cloth, \$4.00.

Litting, G. Sine Worthily Lamented. A course of forty-seven brief sermons for church reading, being one for each week day and Sunday from Ash Wednesday to Easter Day. London: Skeffington, 1893. Pp. 176, p. 8vo, 4s.

Lockhart, W. Dies Tristes: Sermons for Seasons of Sorrow. London: Blackwood, 1893. Pp. 228, p. 8vo, 6s.

Lods, A. Le Livre d'Hénoch, fragments grecs découverts à Akhmim (Haute Egypte) publiés avec les variantes du texte éthiopien, traduits et annotés. Paris: Leroux, 1892. Pp. lxvii., 179, 8vo. [Also] Evangelii Secundum Petrum et Petri Apocalypsoe quae supersunt ad fidem codicis in Egypto

nuper inventi edidit cum latina versione et dissertatione critica. Paris: Leroux, 1892. Pp. 61, 8vo.

Loserth, J. Der Anabaptismus in Tirol von seinen Anfängen bis zum Tode Jakob Hüters (1526-1536). Aus den hinterlassenen Papieren des Dr. Jos. R. von Beck. Wien: Tempelky, 1893. Pp. 178, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

McClymont, J. A., Rev. B.D. The New Testament and its Writers. New York: Randolph, 1893. Pp. vi., 155, 16mo, 25 cts.

Macgregor, G. H. C., Rev. M.A. "So Great Salvation." With an Introduction by the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A. New York: Scribner, 1893. Pp. 138, 16mo, 50 cts.

Maclaren, Alex., D.D. Paul's Prayers and Other Sermons. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. viii., 322, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50. [Also] The Psalms. Vol. I. Psalms 1-xxxviii. (Expositor's Bible.) London: Hodder, 1893. Pp. 394, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Maple, William H. No "Beginning": or, The Fundamental Fallacy. A common-sense exposure of the error in the reasoning upon which is based belief in a "creation" or "first cause" of things. Chicago: Kerr, 1893. Pp. 166, 12mo, \$1.00.

Mason, G. E. Round the Round World on a Church Mission. New York: Young, 1892. Pp. vi., 379, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Massow, C. von. Die Gottheit Christi. Erwiderung eines Laien auf die Schrift des Herrn Prof. Dr. A. Harnack: Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1892. Pp. 77, 8vo, 1 mk.

Matheson, George, Rev. The Distinctive Messages of the Old Religions. New York: Randolph, 1893. Pp. vi., 342, 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

Matter, A. Étude de la Doctrine Chrétiennne. 2 vols. Paris, 1892. Pp. viii., 286, 460, 8vo, 8 fr.

Mayor, Joseph B. The Epistle of St. James: the Greek Text. With introduction, notes and comments. London and New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 220, 248, 8vo, cloth, 14s., \$3.50.

Michaud, E. La théologie et le temps présent. Discours prononcé sur la fête de l'université de Berne le 26. November, 1892. Bern: Schmid, 1893. Pp. 44, 8vo, 50 pf.

Mills, B. Fay, Rev. Victory through Surrender. A message concerning consecrated living. New York: Revell, 1893. Pp. 82, 12mo, 50 cts.

Mitchell, H. G. Amos: An Essay in Exegesis. Chicago: Bartlett, 1893. Pp. iv., 309, 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

Möller, O. Den evangeliske Historie eller Herrens Liv paa Jorden, fremstillet efter det apostoliske Vidnesbyrd og ledsaget af vejledende oplysninger. Anden Udgave. Kjøbenhavn: Schonberg, 1892. Pp. 328, 8vo, 3 25 kr.

Monner Sans, R. Misiones quarantificas (1607-1800). Buenos Aires, 1892. Pp. 232, 8vo. [\$1.50.]

Montefiore, C. G. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Hebrews. Hibbert Lectures, 1892. London: Williams & N., 1893. Pp. 506, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Mosley, T. The Creed; or, a Philosophy. London: Longmans, 1893. Pp. 310, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d. [Discussion on the Anglican Creed—is it a philosophy or a creed?]

Muir, Pearson M'Adam, Rev. The Church of Scotland. A Scotland. New York: Randolph, 1893. Pp. 98, 16mo, 25 cts.

Myaskowski, T. Chronologico historica Introductio in Novum Testamentum. Lemberg: Gubrynowicz, 1892. Pp. viii., 179, 8vo, 4 mk.

Nathusius, M. von. Die Mitarbeit der Kirche an der Lösung der sozialen Frage. I. Die soziale

Frage. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893. Pp. viii., 310, 8vo, 5 mk.

Neteler, B., Dr. Stellung der alttestamentlichen Zeitrechnung in der altorientalischen Geschichte. 2. Untersuchung der Zeiträume von salomo bis Noe. Münster i. W.: Theissing, 1893. Pp. 23, 8vo, 50 pf.

Nichols, George W., Rev., D.D. Miscellanies, Religious and Personal, and Sermons. Bridgeport: Marigold Printing Co., 1893. Pp. 379, 12mo.

Niese, B. Josephi Epitome adhuc inedita pars V. Gelegenheitschrift der Universität Marburg. Marburg, 1892. Pp. 145-209, 4to.

Paine, Thomas, Life of, by the editor of *The National*. With preface, notes and portraits of the most celebrated of Mr. Paine's friends, by Philip Eckler. New York: Eckler, 1893. Pp. x., 88, 8vo, cloth, 50 cts.

Percival, Henry R. M.A. A Digest of Theology. Being a brief statement of Christian doctrine according to the consensus of the great theologians of the One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Together with an Appendix, containing among other things in English, the doctrinal decrees of the (Ecumenical) Synods. Philadelphia: McVey, 1893. Pp. xvi., 311, 12mo.

Phillips, F. Some Mysteries of the Passion. London: Skeffington, 1893. Pp. 66, 12mo, 2s.

Pierce, W., and Horne, C. S. A Primer of Church Fellowship, for Use in the Congregational Churches, Baptist and Independent. London: Hodder, 1893. Pp. 126, 32mo, 1s.

Pulpit Commentary. Ecclesiastes: Exposition, by Rev. W. J. Deane; Homiletics, by Rev. T. Whitelaw; Homilies, by Prof. J. R. Thomson, Rev. W. Clarkson, Rev. J. Willcock. Song of Solomon: Exposition, by Rev. R. A. Bedford; Homiletics, by Rev. B. C. Caffin; Homilies, by Prof. J. R. Thomson. Rev. S. Conway, Rev. J. D. Davies. London: Paul, 1893. Pp. 530, 1st ed. 8vo, 21s.

Pulsford, J. Loyalty to Christ (the Personal and Historic Christ): These Sayings of mine, and His Parables. Vol. 2. London: Simpkin, 1893. Pp. 450, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Renan, E. T. Studies in Religious History. Second series. London: Mathieson, 1893. Pp. 256, p. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Rezek, Ant. Relatio progressus in extirpandis heresi per regnum Bohemiae, marchionatum Moraviae et ducatum utriusque Silesiae, opera Patrum Societatis Jesu provinciae Bohemiae, 1661-1678. Prag: Rivnáč, 1893. Pp. 55, 8vo, 1 mk.

Ricard, Mgr. Monseigneur de Mazenod évêque de Marseille, fondateur de la Congrégation des Missionnaires Oblats de Marie-Immaculée (1782-1861). La Renaissance Catholique dans le premier moitié du XIX^e siècle. 2d ed. Paris: Poussielgue, 1892. Pp. xvi., 474, 8vo.

Richard, J. W., Rev., D.D., and Painter, F. V. N., Rev., A.M. Christian Worship: Its Principles and Forms. Philadelphia: Luth. Pub. Soc., 1893. Pp. viii., 368, 8vo, \$1.50.

Riedler, F. J. Bedingte Eheschliessung. Eine kanonische Untersuchung. Dissertation. Kempten: Kösel, 1892. Pp. 86, 8vo, 2 mk.

Roberts, T. D. Means and Ways: or, Practical Methods in Christian Work. Sketch of the author's life. Introduction by A. J. Gordon, D.D. Boston: Earle, 1893. Pp. 141, 12mo.

Robinson, J. Armitage, and Rhodes, James Montague. The Gospel according to Peter and the Revelation of Peter. Two lectures on the newly recovered fragments: with the Greek texts. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 96, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Rosse, Late Earl of. Argument to Prove the Truth of the Christian Revelation. Modernized by E. L. Garbett. London: Reeves, 1893. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Rost, Paul, Dr. Die Kellechrifttexte Tigrat-Pileers III., nach den Papierabklatschen und Originalen des Britischen Museums neu herausgegeben. 2. Bände. 1. Einleitung, Transcription und Übersetzung. Wörterverzeichnis und Commentar. 2. Autographische Texte. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1893. Pp. viii., xxxix., 145; iii., 24, fo., 20 mk.

Byle, H. E. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. With introduction, notes, and maps. London: Cambridge Warehouse; New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 400, 12mo, 4s. 6d., \$1.25. (*Cambridge Bible for Schools*.)

Sacrifice of Praise. Being the Order for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist according to the use of the Church of England, with the Litany and the proper Collects, Epistles and Gospels, to which are added instructions and devotions for the use of communicants. London: Griffith, 1893. Pp. 430, 32mo, 2s.

Sanford, A. B., Rev., ed. The Methodist Year-Book. Columbian edition. New York: Meth. Book Conc., 1893. Pp. 140, 12mo, paper, 10 cts.

Scott, C. N. The Foregleams of Christianity. Revised and enlarged edition. London: Smith & E., 1893. Pp. 220, p. 8vo, 6s.

Segovia, Joannis de. Sancti Calixti, historia gestorum generalis synodi Basiliensis. Editionem ab Ernesto Birk inchoatam apparatu critico adjecto continuavit Rud. Beer. Vol. II. Liber XVI. (Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi XV. ediderunt cæsarea academia: scilicet: concilium socii delegati. Concilium Basiliense. Scriptorum tom. III., pars II. Wien: Tempelky, 1893. Pp. 390-538, 7.50 mk.

Sermon Bible. The II. Corinthians—Philippians. New York: Armstrong, 1893. Pp. iii., 367, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Shaw, W. Hudson. Introductory Lectures on the Oxford Reformers. Colet, Erasmus and More, delivered in Philadelphia in 1893 under the auspices of the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching. Philadelphia: Am. Soc. Ext. Univ. Teaching, 1893. Pp. 83, 8vo, paper, 50 cts.

Simmons, H. M. The Unending Genesis; or, Creation ever Present. Chicago: Kerr, 1893. Pp. 111, 12mo, 25 cts.

Soleil, F. Les Heures gothiques et la littérature pieuse aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles. Frontispice à l'encre forte par J. Adeline. 24 reproductions, facsimilées, les dessins originaux d'Antoine Duplax-Destouches. Lille: Desclée, 1892. Pp. 309, 8vo.

Spurgeon, C. H. The Pastor in Prayer. Being a choice selection of C. H. Spurgeon's Sunday morning prayers. London: Stock, 1893. Pp. 164, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Stange, Carl. Die christliche Ethik in ihrem Verhältnisse zur modernen Ethik: Paulsen, Wundt, Hartmann. Preisgekrönt von der theologischen Fakultät in Göttingen, Juni 1. 1892. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1893. Pp. vi., 99, 3 mk.

Stewart, Alexander. Handbook of Christian Evidences. New York: Randolph, 1893. Pp. iv., 94, 16mo, 25 cts.

Stone, H. E. Led from Darkness: The History of a Life Struggle. London: Marlborough, 1893. Pp. 202, p. 8vo, 2s. [A religious story.]

Strong, Charles H. In Paradise; or, the State of the Faithful Dead. A study from Scripture on death and after death. New York: Whittaker, 1893. Pp. 119, 12mo, \$1.00.

Thorne, H. Notable Sayings of the Great Teacher, and Other Biblical Studies. Fifty-two Bible Readings. Stirling: Drummond, 1893. Pp. 250, p. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Tiemersma, L. De Geschiedenis der zending van de zending uit Genève tot de oprichting der zending genootschappen, 1535-1792. (Uitsluitend ten voordeele der Evangelisatie door landontginning op

West Java.) Leiden: Donner, 1892. Pp. viii., 104, 8vo., 75 fl.

Tollin, Dr. Die hugenottische Kirchenordnung, oder die discipline des églises réformées de France. (Geschichtsblätter des deutschen Hugenotten Vereins, 10 Heft.) Magdeburg: Heinrichshofen, 1893. Pp. 70, 8vo., 1 50 mk.

Trumbull, Henry Clay. The Ten Commandments as a Covenant of Love. An address before the College Students' Summer School for Bible Study, at Northfield, Mass., July 1, 1888. Philadelphia: Wattles, 1893. Pp. 38, 12mo., 25 cts.

Tucker, F. de L. Booth. The Life of Catherine Booth, the mother of the Salvation Army, with marginal notes and index. London: Salvation Army, 1893. Pp. 960. New York: Revell, 2 vols. Pp. 1355, 8vo., cloth, \$3.50.

Tucker, William, Rev., D.D. Atonement. No. X. of *Mannals of Faith and Duty*. Boston: Univ. Pub. House, 1893. Pp. 100, 16mo., 25 cts.

Tyok, Ch. Notices historiques sur les Congrégations et Communautés religieuses et sur les Instituts des Missionnaires du XIX^e siècle. Louvain: Peters, 1892. 8vo.

Van Ness, Thomas. The Coming Religion. Boston: Roberts, 1893. Pp. 228, 16mo., cloth, \$1.00.

Viokey, J. Ideals of Life taken from Literature, and other Sermons: Discourses to Young Men and Women. London: Clarke, 1892. Pp. 310, p. 8vo., 5s.

W., E. F. Daily Help. Spurgeon. Compiled. Baltimore: Woodward, 1893. Pp. 369, 12mo., 75 cts.

Wacker, E. Wiedergeburt und Bekehrung in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnisse nach der heiligen Schrift. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1892. Pp. 92, 8vo., \$1.00.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, D.D., D.C.L. The Gospel of Life. Thoughts introductory to the study of Christian literature. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. xxiv., 306, p. 8vo., \$1.75.

Williams, C. M. A Review of the Systems of Ethics Founded on the Theory of Evolution. London: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 583, p. 8vo., 12s.

Wolbing, G. Die Mittelalterlichen Lebensbeschreibungen des Bonifatius, ihrem Inhalte nach untersucht, verglichen und erläutert. Leipzig: Fock, 1893. Pp. viii., 160, 8vo., 2 mk.

Wolston, W. T. P. Simon Peter: His Life and Letters. Edinburgh: Gospel Messenger Office, 1893. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Wordsworth, Elizabeth. The Decalogue. London: Longmans, 1893. Pp. 248, p. 8vo., 4s. 6d. [Addresses.]

Wünsche, Aug., Prof., Dr. Midrasch Tehillim oder haggadische Erklärung der Psalmen. Nach der Textausgabe von Salomon Ruber zum 1. Male ins Deutsch übersetzt und mit Noten und Quellenangaben versehen. 2 Bände. Trier: Mayer, 1893. Pp. x., 368, 255, 8vo., 14 mk.

Zahn, Theodor, Prof. Das Apostolische Synbolum. Eine skizze seiner Geschichte und eine Prüfung seines Inhalts. Leipzig: Deichert, 1893. Pp. 103, 8vo., 1.35 mk.

Jan. 18. Inauguration of Charles Kendall Adams, LL.D., President of Wisconsin University.

Jan. 19. Thirty-second Anniversary of the Woman's Union Missionary Society in Brooklyn.

Inauguration of Rev. M. Woolsey Stryker, D.D., President of Hamilton College.

Jan. 24. Organization by the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions of a new department to disseminate knowledge of mission needs among the young. Mr. Thornton B. Penfield has been placed in charge.

Conference in Toronto relating to church union between committees representing Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Anglicans.

Jan. 25. Consecration in Duluth of the Rev. William Morris Barker, D.D., Missionary Bishop of Western Colorado.

Jan. 31. Day of Prayer for Schools and Colleges. The Trustees of Lane Theological Seminary at Cincinnati declined to accept the resignation of Professor Smith, but declared vacant the professorship of Practical Theology, held by Professor Roberts.

Feb. 7. Meeting in Louisville, Ky., of the Presbyterian General Assembly's Committee on the Directory of Worship.

Feb. 15-18. Sixth Annual Deaconess Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Cincinnati.

Feb. 16. Memorial service at Carnegie Music Hall, New York City, in honor of Phillips Brooks.

Feb. 16-17. Inter-seminary District Missionary Alliance of the Central District at New Brunswick.

Feb. 19. Celebration of the archiepiscopal Jubilee of Pope Leo XIII.

The following prelates are reported to have been elevated to the Cardinalate on January 16: Mgr. G. R. Meignan, Archbishop of Tours, France; Mgr. L. B. Ch. Thomas, Archbishop of Cologne, Germany; Mgr. C. Vassary, Archbishop of Grau and Primate of Hungary; Mgr. Benito Sanz y Fores, Archbishop of Seville, Spain; Mgr. L. Galimberti, Papal Nuncio at Madrid; Mgr. Persico, Secretary of the Propaganda; Mocenni, Under-Secretary of State.

Rt. Rev. Martin Rogatien was consecrated Bishop of Uranopolis and Vicar Apostolic of the Marquesas Islands, in San Francisco, January 1.

Rt. Rev. M. F. Burke, Roman Catholic Bishop of Cheyenne, has been transferred to the see of St. Joseph's.

The venerable Dr. King has resigned the see of Norwich. He is the senior prelate, though not the oldest, on the bench.

Rt. Rev. George Howard Wilkinson, late Bishop of Truro, has been elected to the see of St. David's, Dunkeld and Dunblane, to succeed Bishop Wordsworth.

Rev. F. K. Brooke, D.D., was consecrated missionary bishop of Oklahoma in Topeka, Kan., January 6.

Rt. Rev. Dr. Lewis, Bishop of Ontario, has been elected Metropolitan of the Province of Canada in succession to the late Bishop Medley.

The Methodist Episcopal Seminary at Atlanta, Ga., falls heir to \$750,000 by the death of Mrs. Gammon.

The Rev. C. C. Camp, of Joliet, has accepted the Professorship of New Testament Exegesis in Seabury Divinity School.

Rev. N. Walling Clark has accepted the presidency of the Methodist Theological School in Italy.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 30th of each month.)

Jan. 11-12. Twenty-fifth anniversary of the Woman's Board of Missions in Boston.

Jan. 15. Consecration of Dr. Clifford, first Bishop of Lucknow, in St. Paul's Cathedral, Calcutta.

Rev. T. W. Kretschmann has been appointed instructor in Hebrew in the (Lutheran) Mt. Airy Seminary.

Professor W. J. Tucker, of Andover, after declining twice, has accepted the presidency of Dartmouth College.

The Rev. A. C. Peck, D.D. (Methodist Episcopal), has been elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

OBITUARY.

Anderson, Rev. Samuel Thomas (Cumberland Presbyterian), Ph.D., D.D. (Waynesburg College, Pa., 1864), at Los Angeles, Cal., January 10, aged 66. He was graduated from Cumberland University, 1852; studied in Union Theological Seminary, 1852-53; was ordained, 1854; was evangelist for one year; became professor in Chapel Hill College, Texas, the same year; in Union College, Miss., 1858; and of Union College, Ill., 1859; was elected President of Missouri Female College, 1860; became pastor of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church at Waynesburg, Pa., 1864, serving also as Professor of Hebrew and Greek in the college there; became pastor at Lebanon, O., 1866, and of (Congregational) church at Napoli, N. Y., 1869; he was in the foreign missionary field (United Presbyterian) at Trinidad, West Indies, 1872-77; returned to the United States, and served as Professor of Mathematics in Trinity University, Texas, 1877-83. Ill-health compelled his retirement, and he withdrew to Los Angeles, where he died.

Brooks, Rt. Rev. Phillips (Protestant Episcopal), D.D. (Harvard, 1877; Oxford, 1885; Columbia College, 1887), in Boston, January 23, aged 57. He was graduated from Harvard College, 1856, and from the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Virginia, 1859; became rector of the Church of the Advent, Philadelphia, 1859; of the Church of the Holy Trinity, same city, 1862; and of Trinity Church, Boston, 1866. In 1881 he declined the Plummer Professorship of Christian Morals and Preaching to Harvard College, and in 1886 the election to the assistant Bishopric of Pennsylvania. In 1891 he was elected Bishop of Massachusetts, which election was accepted by him. Some opposition to the ratification of his election arose in the High-Church Party, but the election was confirmed by a large majority. His consecration took place in Boston, October 14, 1891. He has published "Lectures on Preaching before the Divinity School of Yale College," "Influence of Jesus" (Bohlen Lectures), "Candle of the Lord, and Other Sermons," "Sermons Preached in English Churches," and numerous other volumes of sermons.

Bulkeley, Rev. Charles Henry Augustus (Presbyterian), D.D. (Howard University, 1880), in Washington, D.C., February 2, aged 73. He was graduated from University of City of New York, 1839, and from Union Theological Seminary, 1842; was ordained and took pastorate at New Brunswick, N. J., same year; became home missionary in Wisconsin, 1843; pastor at Mt. Morris, N. Y., 1847; was stated supply for Reformed Dutch Church at Ithaca, N. Y., 1850-52; for Congregational Church at Winsted, Ct., 1853-56, and at Paterson, N. J., 1859-61; was Chaplain U. S. Army, 1861-63; pastor at Owego, N. Y., 1863-67; Chaplain Y. M. C. A., Brooklyn, 1867-68; became pastor of Presbyterian Church, Malone, N. Y., 1868; professor in Boston, Mass., 1875; pastor at Port Henry, N. Y., 1876, and Professor of Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres in Howard University, 1881. He had been a contributor to the *Century* and to many other magazines and newspapers.

Dwenger, Rt. Rev. Joseph (Roman Catholic), D.D., in Fort Wayne, Ind., January 22, aged 56. He was educated in Holy Trinity School, Cincinnati; was ordained to the priesthood, 1859; accompanied Archbishop Purcell to the second Plenary Council at Baltimore as theologian; engaged in missionary

work, 1867-72; was consecrated to the bishopric, 1872; visited Rome in various official capacities in 1883, 1885 and 1888, and in the latter year was granted a private audience with Pope Leo XIII.

Grier, Rev. Smith F. (Presbyterian), D.D., in New Cumberland, W. Va., January 10, aged 72. He was graduated at Jefferson College, 1839, and at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1841; was ordained and took charge of Valley Church, Pa., 1843, and removed to New Cumberland, W. Va., in 1852, which charge he held till his death, his pastorate thus covering a period of over forty years.

Jones, Rev. Benjamin T. (Presbyterian), D.D. (Lafayette College, 1859), at Oxford, Pa., January 20, aged 52. He was graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary, 1866; was ordained and became pastor at Berlin, Md., the same year; removed to Lewisburg, 1867, and to West Chester, 1873; he was elected Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in Lincoln University, 1883, and later was transferred to the chair of New Testament Literature and the English Bible; while performing the duties of his professorship he took charge of various churches in the surrounding country, being successful in building up the churches at Fogg's Manor and Wallingford.

Royall, William (Baptist), D.D., LL.D., in Savannah, Ga., January 3, aged 70. He was graduated from South Carolina College, 1841; engaged in teaching for a year and studied law till 1844, when he relinquished the study of law and was ordained to the ministry; preached to several churches in South Carolina till 1849; in Georgia was pastor till 1851, and did missionary work in Florida till 1853; accepted professorship in Furman University, N. C., 1855; was elected Professor of Languages in Wake Forest College, N. C., 1857; founded Raleigh Baptist Female Seminary, 1872; taught in the seminaries of Bryant and Calvert, Texas, 1874-75; became President of Baylor Female University, Independence, Texas, and afterward became head of the Female Seminary at San Antonio, Texas.

Worcester, Rev. John Hopkins, Jr. (Presbyterian), D.D. (University of Vermont, 1838), at Lakewood, N. J., February 8, aged 47. He was graduated at the University of Vermont, 1865; studied at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, 1867-69; spent a year in Europe and graduated from the above-named seminary, 1871; was professor *pro tempore* of English Literature at the University of Vermont, 1871; ordained by Presbytery of Morris and Orange, 1872, and became pastor at South Orange, 1872; called to pastorate of Sixth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, 1883; elected Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Divinity in Union Theological Seminary, 1891, the duties of which chair he performed until within a few days of his death.

CALENDAR.

Feb. 17, and successive Fridays till March 24, delivery of the Bishop Paddock Lectures by Bishop Cox on the General Theological Seminary, New York City. General subject, "The Repose of the Blessed Dead." Special topics: "Sheol;" "The Spirits in Prison;" "Abraham's Bosom;" "The Descent into Hell;" "Paradise and the Just Made Perfect."

March 1. Meeting in New York of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

March 9. Moravian Christian Endeavor Conference in the Sixth Street Moravian Church, New York.

March 20. Tri-centennial in Minneapolis of the issuance of the Decree of Upsala.

April 24-28. Conference on the "Progress of the Gospel on the Continent," in London. Delegates from the Reformed Churches are expected to be present.